Dreiser Studies

ISSN 0896-6362

Volume 35, Number 1 Summer 2004

CONTENTS

Essays

Donald Pizer,
Dreiser and the Jews 3

Annemarie Koning Whaley,
Business Is Business: Corporate America
in the Restored *Jennie Gerhardt* 24

Roger W. Smith,
A Dreiser Checklist, 2000–2001 38

Reviews

The Cambridge Companion to Theodore Dreiser,
edited by Leonard Cassuto and Clare Virginia Eby
Reviewed by Carol S. Loranger 53

An Honest Writer: The Life and Times of James T. Farrell,
by Robert K. Landers
Reviewed by Dennis Flynn 55

H. L. Mencken on American Literature, edited by S. T. Joshi
Mencken's America, edited by S. T. Joshi
Reviewed by Leonard Cassuto 58

The Jungle, by Upton Sinclair. Edited by Clare Virginia Eby
Reviewed by Philip Gerber 61

The Vast and Terrible Drama: American Literary Naturalism in the Late Nineteenth Century, by Eric Carl Link
Reviewed by Roger W. Smith 63

American Literary Realism, Critical Theory, and Intellectual Prestige, 1880–1995, by Phillip Barrish
Reviewed by Stephen C. Brennan 66

Schwester Carrie, by Theodore Dreiser. Translated by Anna Nussbaum. Introduction by Heike Paul
Reviewed by Renate von Bardeleben 68

News & Notes 70

Contributors 70

Dreiser and the Jews

Donald Pizer
Tulane University

There are several reasons for once more plunging into the vexing and thorny subject of Dreiser's anti-Semitism, an area of concern since Hutchins Hapgood published his widely discussed article "Is Dreiser Anti-Semitic?" almost seventy years ago. One is that forthcoming editions of Dreiser's previously uncollected interviews and letters contain material which casts considerable new light on the issue.[1] Another is that though Dreiser's anti-Semitism is frequently noted or briefly commented upon, there is lacking a full overview of the subject, an absence which I hope to rectify by this essay.[2] I should note, however, that I will be unable to engage in an extended exploration of the many ramifications of Dreiser's beliefs about the Jews for his ideas, work, and career in general. My principal purpose—to offer a history of his relationship to Jews from his late teens to his death—and the limitations of a journal article preclude this kind of expansive treatment of the subject. I will, rather, by means of a thorough review of his writings about and relationships to Jews throughout the various phases of his career, seek to clarify his basic beliefs in this area. A realization of the full dimensions of these beliefs should, if nothing else, dissuade those writing about Dreiser from assuming either that any single instance in the history of this subject represents the entire subject or that the entire subject can be easily grasped and summarized.

Dreiser does not mention either in *Dawn* or *A Hoosier Holiday*, his autobiographies dealing with his Indiana boyhood, any contact with Jews before his arrival in Chicago. It has been common to assume, however, that his later beliefs about Jews can be attributed in part to the anti-Semitism often found during this period both in working-class Catholic homes and western popular belief. It was common for Populist leaders of the 1890s to employ anti-Semitic rhetoric when characterizing the eastern and foreign bankers

Dreiser Studies • Summer 2004, Vol. 35, No. 1
© 2004 Dreiser Studies

who supposedly controlled the fate of western farmers (Cohen; Higham). Dreiser's childhood background thus contained the mix of religious and economic sources characteristic of much anti-Semitism.

Dreiser's account in *Dawn* of his initial significant encounter with Jews is almost allegorical in its endorsement of the anti-Semitic myth of the Jew as unscrupulous exploiter of the unwary. In the spring of 1891, just short of twenty, Dreiser was working as a laundry driver in Chicago when he was approached by one of the Jewish owners of a rival company who, "oily" and "ingratiating" (558), offers him a seemingly far superior position. Dreiser accepts, but once hired finds that the job is very different than promised. Its conditions are more severe, his pay less than indicated, and he is expected to entice customers from his previous employer. In addition, he has an accident for which, though not at fault, he is held responsible. Angry and dismayed, Dreiser decides that

> Jews, for the moment at least, were anathema to me, not so much because they were opposed to me in this instance—though that was not without its import—as they appeared so sly or clever and withal conscienceless. The morals and trade fairness of the average Gentile as I saw them then—race prejudice, possibly—appeared so much better. Jews, as I then pictured them to myself, were opportunists, with a fine eye for the immediate loophole, regardless of shame, pride, dignity, fairness, anything you will. (563–64)

The stereotype of the Jew as ruthless urban entrepreneur is here fully expressed. Smooth and ingratiating initially in order to entrap the unknowing, his underlying characteristics of shrewdness, untrustworthiness, and what Dreiser was often later to call "sharp practices" soon emerge.

However, since Dreiser wrote and revised *Dawn* during the mid-teens, after his experience of Jews had greatly expanded, he was careful to qualify and therefore in part condemn his earlier characterization in several significant ways. His preference for Gentile businessmen, he admits, may be "race prejudice," and he is at pains to make clear that he has since modified his views, noting that his belief that Jews were opportunists was "as I *then* pictured them" (my italics). He closes the passage with the apologetic remark that "I was not then aware, as I am to-day, of the possible beauty of the individual soul in any race, Jew as well as Gentile" (564).[3]

Dreiser had many occasions to encounter Jews in more favorable circumstances than as exploitative employers in the decade following his late 1910 return to a literary career. He lived during this period in New York—from 1914 to 1919 in Greenwich Village—where he came to know many Jews who were artists, writers, scientists, and intellectuals. Among the most

prominent were Abraham Cahan (the founder of the *Jewish Daily Forward* and a novelist of East Side Jewish life), A. A. Brill (Freud's American translator), Jerome Blum (a Chicago artist), Horace Kallen (a philosopher and Judaic scholar), and David Karsner and Mike Gold (left-wing writers). (It is perhaps also worth noting that his mistress from 1913 to 1916 was the actress Kirah Markham, who was half-Jewish.) This was a period of both an increasing Jewish presence in American intellectual and artistic life and of mass immigration of largely impoverished Eastern European Jews whose initial home was often on Manhattan's Lower East Side. Dreiser's sympathetic engagement with Jewish life during this phase of his career is signified not only by his acceptance of Jews as intellectual and artistic equals, but also by his composition in 1916 of *The Hand of the Potter*, a tragic play set among Lower East Side Jews.

The Hand of the Potter, though written in 1916, was not published until 1919 and not produced until late 1921, and it is the only work by Dreiser devoted to a depiction of Jewish life. The play echoes much early twentieth-century Jewish-American fiction and drama in that one of its principal themes is the conflict between immigrant parents and their Americanized children. It is also, however, a striking departure in that Isadore, the oldest son of the thread peddler Aaron Berchansky, suffers from a hormone-induced sexual deviancy which leads him to attack young girls. The central actions of the play are his killing of an eleven-year old neighbor and his own eventual suicide.

This was controversial material in 1916 (H. L. Mencken strongly advised Dreiser against publishing or producing the play), but not because of what might be taken as the author's conscious linking of sexual degeneracy with the Jews. Some later critics, notably Sol Liptzin, have questioned Dreiser's motives in his setting a story of this kind among East Side immigrants (159),[4] but this was not an issue raised at the time or for many years afterwards. Liptzin and others have also questioned Dreiser's depiction of a Jewish landlord who, Shylock-like, demands his rent in the midst of a family tragedy. Despite these later objections, Abraham Cahan, when he saw the play in 1921, wrote an enthusiastic review in the *Forward* and also wrote Dreiser praising the play, a response which pleased Dreiser greatly.[5] And Dreiser himself, once the issue of his anti-Semitism became public in the 1930s, offered the play as evidence to the contrary[6] and indeed also claimed that the banning of his books in Germany had arisen from the belief that the author of the play, which had had a successful German production in the 1920s, must be Jewish.[7]

It is understandable that the Nazi belief in Jewish racial degeneracy

made post-holocaust critics especially sensitive to the representation of a "degenerate" Jew. It is equally apparent, however, that Dreiser's intent in the play was not to suggest that Jews are more prone to biological deficiencies than other groups but rather to dramatize the tragic truth that nature is unfair, that it will often strike down the already weak and oppressed, a category of humanity which of course included the East Side Jewish poor now fully evident to Dreiser just a few miles from his lower Manhattan home. Indeed, Dreiser's emphasis in the play was above all on the pain of Aaron Berchansky, one of the many fathers in Dreiser's works whose expression of love for his children is thwarted by the circumstances of his life. The emotional climax of the play is not the crime itself but Aaron's soul-wrenching plea to his son, after the crime, that he kill himself.

Several conditions came together during the early 1920s to ensure that Dreiser and his work were positively received by Jewish critics and readers. By this time, Dreiser had achieved recognition as a major American author. It was thus gratifying to Jews to have a writer of his stature devote an entire work, as no other prominent American novelist had done, to the depiction of immigrant Jewish life. It also did Dreiser's reputation no harm among New York's almost universally left-leaning Jewish intelligentsia that he at this time often adopted socialist positions and contributed frequently to the socialist journal *The Call*. The esteem with which Dreiser was held in the Jewish community during this period is suggested by an April 1924 interview with him in *The Day*, a prominent New York Yiddish newspaper, in which most of the interview was given over to Dreiser's questions about Jewish life in New York. The interview concludes:

> From the amazingly great amount of information which Mr. Dreiser has about Jewish life in New York, from the subtle points he seems to have gathered from study and observation, together with his power of perception of detail and color, we can expect from him some day the American novel on the Jew in America. (Jaffe)

The Day interview was among four important interviews that Dreiser gave to Jewish journals during the 1920s—a fact indicative both of the degree of Jewish interest in him during this period and of the cessation of this interest after the notorious 1933 *American Spectator* conference on the Jews and the onset of Dreiser's public reputation as a possible anti-Semite. The first, by Berenice Skidelsky, appeared in the Boston *Jewish Advocate* in February 1920 and was soon afterwards reprinted in the *New York Jewish News*. Throughout the interview Dreiser was remarkably positive in his

view of the Jewish contribution to American life. Skidelsky reported that Dreiser "declares that the Jews of America are as yeast added to the other ingredients in the nation's making. He sees in them an indispensable leaven for the satisfactory rising and formation of the mass." Their qualities of "warmth," "sweetness," and "love of life" provide them with an intense interest in experience. "They are essentially artists," Skidelsky quotes Dreiser as stating, "transfiguring the commonplace with a glow of hope, and seeing in the hum-drum everyday a stepping-stone to a larger and more vigorous life toward which they are always reaching out." After offering the Lower East Side as an example of these characteristics, Dreiser went on to interpret Jewish business success as above all a triumph of the "imagination." "The Jew sees possibilities in a nickel," Dreiser stated, "which wouldn't be apparent to others in a hundred dollars. . . ." "That attitude of mind, or rather of spirit, said Mr. Dreiser, . . . makes for commercial progress, and at the same time it introduces poetry into business." Dreiser went on to note the prominence of Jews in the arts, and then concluded:

> All of this direction and achievement is expression of a warm, perfectly legitimate sensuality, inherent in the Jewish temperament, and pregnant with color and vitality.[8] It is an Oriental quality which, infused into the comparative rigidity of the Western peoples, lends them a greater flexibility and thereby offers promise of a richer life.

This extraordinary effusion is important for two interrelated reasons. First, Dreiser's remarks constitute an almost point-by-point refutation of the principal anti-Semitic arguments of the period. The Jew is not a vulgar, grasping materialist whose shady commercial practices pollute the national ethos but an artist and poet in all his endeavors. Though his "Orientalism" (a key term in much early twentieth-century anti-Semitism)[9] may distinguish him from "Western peoples," we would all benefit, rather than suffer, from an assimilation of these qualities into our culture. Second, as we shall see, Dreiser almost completely reversed his position on these arguments during the 1930s.

I do not wish to suggest that Dreiser during the late teens and early twenties had completely obliterated the kind of conventional stereotyping of Jews which characterized his response to the Jewish Chicago laundry owner of his youth. One of his most frequently reprinted anti-Semitic remarks occurred during a 5 November 1922 letter to Mencken, when, on his return to New York after three years in California, he stated that "N. Y. to me is a scream—a Kyke's dream of a Ghetto. The lost tribe has taken the is-

land" (Elias 2: 405). To other friends about the same time he wrote that the city had "Too many Jews" and "To [*sic*] many unidealistic Jews" (Swanberg 267). Comments of this kind reveal Dreiser's tendency throughout his life to speak more critically about the Jews in his personal correspondence than in his public statements. But it is also possible, at least for this specific period in his career, to make too much of this distinction. Whatever Dreiser's almost reflexive anti-Semitic comments during these years regarding Jews as a group, his conscious intellectual position is best represented by his 1920 interview with Berenice Skidelsky, when he heartily and even fulsomely endorsed their presence on the American scene.

Dreiser began to turn away from this position in the late 1920s; indeed, it is possible to cite an incident in March 1926 as a crucial moment in this reversal. Since 1918, Dreiser had been publishing his works with Boni and Liveright, a firm controlled by Horace Liveright, a New York born and educated Jew. Dreiser had initially been attracted by Liveright's willingness to take chances and by his flamboyant and aggressive publishing tactics, but by the mid-1920s he also had begun to doubt his trustworthiness. All seemed to be made well by the great success of *An American Tragedy*, which Boni and Liveright published in late 1925. The novel received glowing reviews, was a best-seller, and both play and film versions were being planned. Liveright was acting as Dreiser's agent in connection with these adaptations, and for the movie version had begun negotiations with Jesse L. Lasky, head of Famous Players–Lasky film company. W. A. Swanberg, in his *Dreiser* (1965), and Tom Dardis, in his *Firebrand: The Life of Horace Liveright* (1995), have recounted at considerable length the complicated story of Dreiser's and Liveright's unspoken and usually false assumptions about their agreement on how much was to be asked for the film rights and about what was to be Liveright's agent's share for the sale. It is therefore only necessary here to specify Dreiser's interpretation of what occurred at the infamous meeting involving Dreiser, Liveright, and Lasky at the Ritz Hotel in March 1926, when Liveright accused Dreiser of being a liar and Dreiser threw a cup of coffee in his face and stormed out of the meeting. Since Liveright had initially indicated that $35,000 was the highest he thought Lasky would offer for the rights, but since Lasky when pressed was in fact willing to pay $80,000 as Dreiser's share, Dreiser believed that Lasky and Liveright, who were old friends, had conspired in advance of the meeting to offer Dreiser the lower price. Liveright's agent's share would be much less at this price, but Lasky would more than make up that loss.[10] Although Dreiser did not mention in his various accounts of the incident that Lasky and Liveright were Jews, it is not difficult, especially in relation to

his later comments on unscrupulous Jews in the movie and publishing businesses, to see him construing the incident as a repetition of the archetype of Jewish sharp dealing he had encountered in Chicago. Here again the unknowing and trusting country boy was being set up as a patsy by conniving urban Jews.

Indeed, Dreiser's belief that the deal with Famous Players–Lasky was tainted by underhandedness involving Jews received confirmation, he believed, by a revelation several years later concerning the 1926 contract he signed with the company. Lasky failed to produce a silent film version of *An American Tragedy*, but in mid-1930, Paramount (the successor of Famous Players–Lasky) became interested in a talkie version. Dreiser, however, believed that his original sale of the rights covered only a silent film, and he wrote the New York lawyer Theodore Kiendl on 18 August 1930 requesting an opinion (DPUP). In the course of this letter, Dreiser noted that before agreeing to Lasky's terms in 1926, he had consulted with Louis Levy, a lawyer with Chadbourne, Stanchfield & Levy, a firm which had represented him earlier. It was only later that he discovered that the firm also had a business relationship with Famous Players–Lasky and that the terms of the contract endorsed by Levy were, Dreiser believed, therefore biased in favor of Famous Players. Again, as with the original sale, there appeared to be a conspiracy involving Jews to cheat Dreiser.

It is therefore not surprising that Dreiser's final two interviews with Jewish journals, in February 1929 and June 1930, have a very different cast than those of the early 1920s. In the first, "Dreiser Looks at the Russian Jews," Sulamith Ish-Kishor questioned Dreiser, who had made a highly publicized journey to the Soviet Union a year earlier, about the condition of Russian Jews. Most Jews in the Soviet Union are unhappy, Dreiser responded, because the communist economic system does not permit full expression of their talents as "natural-born traders." "The Jews are natural born-traders [he repeats]; for centuries they've been acting as go-betweens. . . . It may be something biologically, ethnically, even—who knows—psycho-genetically predestined." Russia contains "many idealistic Jews who study all the time and never make a cent," Dreiser admits, "but they're not the active members of the race, the ones you encounter everywhere." This distinction between the Jew as rarely-encountered idealist and as omnipresent natural-born trader is reflected in the interview itself, since Dreiser has very little to say about Russian Jews as artists and intellectuals, that is, as the possible "yeast" in Soviet culture, but rather devotes almost all his attention to the ineradicable "trader" qualities of Jews that make the "race" unassimilable within contemporary Russian society. Dreiser, in brief,

has moved from a consideration of the Jew founded on the Jewish aptitude for the life of the mind and spirit (the capacity for "imagination," "poetry," and a "richer life" he attributed to Jews in 1920) to one which stressed an instinctive compulsion to engage in profitable commerce.

Dreiser's final interview on the Jews, "Theodore Dreiser Discounts Intermarriage," appeared in the San Francisco *Jewish Journal* in June 1930, when he was in the city to visit the imprisoned radical Tom Mooney. Although the interview, by Raymond Dannenbaum, covers a variety of topics, it is united by Dreiser's contempt for many Jewish assumptions and beliefs, a contempt which often reflects traditional anti-Semitic attitudes. Jews don't really support Zionism, he begins, because "You want to be everywhere like gypsies. You want to be a race which envelops the earth. You'd like to have your fingers in every pie" (the pushy Jew). Jews are "neurotically conscious of opposition" (the oversensitive Jew). "You're in the forefront of every movement, and yet you keep shouting for a lift" (the Jew asking for special favors). "The Jew an eternal defender of Justice? Bunk! Jews have always crybabied about Justice, but what they want is Justice for themselves—a special and particularly pro-Jewish Justice. That's not Justice!" (again the Jew as self-centered special pleader). "Jews *invented* commerce. . . . And your great Jewish banking firms. Don't they move the wheels of commerce today?" (the Jew as International Banker, controlling world trade).

It is of interest that this interview with its anti-Semitic tone appeared at the onset of the 1930s, a decade marked by a significant increase in American anti-Semitism. On the national scene, the deepening depression heightened the traditional use of the Jew as scapegoat. Henry Ford and others had found new "evidence" during the early 1920s in the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" forgery for the conspiratorial theory of Jewish world domination, and during the thirties various nativist and fascist groups continued to spread the message that the depression had been caused by international Jewish bankers (Ferkiss; Ribuffo). The prominence of the Nazi party in German politics during the late twenties and early thirties, climaxed by Hitler's coming to power in early 1933, gave exposure and credibility to virulent anti-Semitic ideas and practices. And throughout the United States, the earlier often sporadic and tacit exclusion of Jews from social and educational institutions became a more widespread and openly expressed policy (Synnott).

Given this tendency in society at large and given the drift in his own beliefs during the 1920s, Dreiser probably did not need any further stimulus toward a more pronounced anti-Semitism during the 1930s. But if he did, his further difficulties with Paramount in 1931 over the filming of *An*

American Tragedy would have provided it. To tell a long and complicated story briefly (it takes Swanberg over five pages to narrate it),[11] after Dreiser signed a contract for a sound version of the novel in early January 1931, a script was quickly prepared by the writer Samuel Hoffenstein, and the movie, directed by Josef von Sternberg, was put into production. The contract specified that Dreiser could review the script and make suggestions for change but that Paramount had the power to make the movie it wished to. Dreiser did object vehemently to the script, since it omitted almost all of the novel's social themes in favor of its love story and crime elements, but Paramount went ahead with its version. Dreiser then persuaded a group of New York intellectuals to attend an advance showing of the movie; when this group agreed with his judgment, he unsuccessfully sought to persuade a court to issue an injunction against its distribution.

In all, this scenario took almost half a year to play out, from January to mid-summer 1931, with Dreiser at the end believing that his work had been perverted by a Hollywood company far more interested in profits than in preserving the integrity of a major work of art. Although Dreiser did not at this time specifically cite himself as the victim of a group of unscrupulous Jews, it is hard to believe that the thought was not there. The same company which had attempted to cheat him in 1926 was at the center of the controversy. It was still headed by Lasky, and indeed Liveright had joined it as a producer in the summer of 1930. And the major figures in determining the shape of the movie adaptation, Hoffenstein and von Sternberg, were both Jews.

In addition, in the years that followed this incident the specific target of Dreiser's anti-Semitism was often the film industry, which was of course dominated by Jews in every phase of ownership and production. Dreiser expressed a characteristic example of this animus in May 1933, when he wrote a cautionary letter to Sherwood Anderson on how to deal with Hollywood film companies. Always get everything in writing, Dreiser advised.

> Next, in connection with any contract offered you, in the first place avoid signing it until you have had a chance to study it and, furthermore, to have an American lawyer, not a Jewish one, examine the contract for you. Do not take the statement or the paper of any lawyer representing any Hollywood proposition without first turning it over to your own lawyer—always an American—with a view to getting yourself straight.
>
> If you do not do these things, you will probably find that you have let yourself in for complete defeat in whatever it is you wish to do.[12]

Having been "taken" not only in his youth by Chicago laundry owners but more recently by their descendants, Hollywood film moguls, Dreiser is advising another village-bred Midwesterner to be wary.

Dreiser's increasing irritation with certain aspects of the Jewish presence in America did not receive widespread attention until the early and mid 1930s, when he "went public" in spectacular fashion. He had become one of the founding editors (along with Ernest Boyd, George Jean Nathan, Eugene O'Neill, and James Branch Cabell) of the *American Spectator*, a tabloid literary monthly which published its initial issue in September 1932. From the first, Dreiser believed that the journal should also deal with serious social concerns, while Boyd and Nathan, who were its managing editors, were for maintaining a lighter note. Something of this division appears in the "Editorial Conference (With Wine)" which appeared in the September 1933 issue. The four editors other than Dreiser sought to bring a comic and even burlesque tone to their discussion of the conference's topic of the Jew in America. (Cabell's contribution was that the Jewish problem could be solved by awarding American Jews the state of Kansas.) Dreiser, however, was uniformly substantive and somber in his remarks. His "quarrel" with Jews, he stated, was that the Jew was "really too clever and too dynamic in his personal and racial attack on all other types of persons and races." Given their aggressive shrewdness, Jews tend to take over certain occupations and indeed entire nations. In the course of the discussion, Dreiser offered several possible responses to this problem. Jews could be limited in number in professions such as law or they could be encouraged to establish their own nation. Dreiser also presented for discussion the belief of "a distinguished Jewish friend," whom he does not name, that the Jew "be left just as he is, persecuted if you please, Hitlerized or progromed or socially discriminated against, but left to work out his fate according to his present circumstances and handicaps or advantages, as you will." The basis for this view is that because Jews drift to where they can "share in and take advantage" of what nations have to offer, they are always outsiders and as such can expect to be persecuted.

Dreiser's statements in the conference, both his and those he attributes to a friend, support the traditional anti-Semitic view that it is the Jew himself, because he is so aggressive and shrewd in his pursuits (the conventional image of the Jew as "pushy" and as committed to "sharp practices"), who is to blame for being persecuted and for being severely restricted in the range of his activities. This idea was especially disturbing in relation to events of the early 1930s. European and American fascist organizations had been increasingly open throughout that period in their call for the "control" of Jews by

both legislation and violence, and in January 1933 this position appeared to receive major validation by Hitler's assumption of power in Germany. Dreiser may have thought he was distancing himself from remarks that fail to condemn social discrimination, pogroms, and Hitler's promise to curb the role of the Jew in Germany by attributing them to someone else, but even to introduce them seriously into the discussion was provocative and foolhardy, since they suggest that one way to settle the problem of the stateless, leech-like Jew in America was to leave him to his own fate at the hand of anti-Semitic mobs.

Dreiser was in fact aware of the incendiary character of his comments. He wrote to George Jean Nathan on 26 May 1933, shortly after the conference took place,

> This editorial conference article cannot go through without a final o. k. from me, as well as an o. k., of course, from the other editors. It involves statements and a point of view which, coming from me, are sure to have national reactions and we will have to be careful of the language. I want to o. k. all my remarks in specific detail. (DPUP)

It is difficult to gauge "national reactions," but the article was widely commented upon and also received one response in particular, that by Hutchins Hapgood, which was eventually to provide Dreiser with widespread notoriety as an anti-Semite.

Hapgood was an old friend from Dreiser's years as a Greenwich Village resident during the 1910s. Though not a Jew, he had made his literary reputation with *The Spirit of the Ghetto* (1902), a work sympathetically depicting East Side Jewish life. Hapgood wrote initially on 4 October, addressing his letter to the editors of the *American Spectator* and also not naming any individual conferee in the letter itself. His basic point was that he expected better of a "liberal" journal than an article which appeared to endorse, at this particular moment in history, popular prejudices against the Jews. He also expressed the Marxist position that anti-Semitism obscured a realization of the centrality of class warfare in the modern world. "The legitimate struggle today is between groups divided on economic policy and interests. Other points of struggle—national, racial and religious—are throwbacks and barbaric remnants, and so obscuring and harmful" (Elias 2: 649).

Hapgood appears to have written with the expectation that his comments would be published by the *Spectator* as a letter to the editor. Instead, Ernest Boyd responded briefly to Hapgood and then turned over Hapgood's letter to Dreiser, who responded at length on 10 October. Hapgood then replied to

Dreiser on 18 October, and on 28 December Dreiser answered. Hapgood then closed the correspondence with a letter to Dreiser on 28 February 1934. The more formal context and therefore more restrained tone both of Dreiser's published conference comments and of Hapgood's initial letter to the editors thus gave way to the greater directness and openness of a personal correspondence between two old friends, and it this portion of the exchange—Hapgood's second and third letters and Dreiser's replies to Hapgood's first and second letters—that Hapgood published in the *Nation* on 17 April 1935. It is not known why Hapgood waited a year and a half before he published the correspondence. A likely explanation, however, is that the tide of anti-Semitism throughout the world and in Europe in particular had increased even further and that he eventually felt compelled to help expose its dangers in whatever way he could.

It is not necessary to discuss Hapgood's letters other than to comment that he pulled no punches when he commented in his brief introduction to the correspondence that he was "horrified and astonished" by Dreiser's initial letter of 10 October and when he noted in his own letter of 18 October that Dreiser's letter was a "clear expression . . . of anti-Semitism" and that if Dreiser "hadn't signed the letter I might have thought that it was written by a member of the Ku Klux Klan or a representative of Hitler" (Hapgood 436, 437). To realize what disturbed Hapgood so greatly, it is necessary to isolate Dreiser's key points, since his two long letters are characteristically Dreiserian in the sense that they diffusely cover much tangential ground.

Dreiser's diagnosis of the Jewish problem contains the familiar charge, though now stated by him more vehemently than ever before in a public forum, that Jews gather principally in the professions and commerce and that their behavior in these areas is suspect. In the most often quoted passage from Dreiser's letters to Hapgood, he charged that

> they are not the day laborers of the world—pick and shovel; they are by preference lawyers, bankers, merchants, money-lenders and brokers, and middlemen. If you listen to Jews discuss Jews, you will find that they are money-minded, very pagan, very sharp in practice, and, usually, in so far as the rest is concerned, they have the single objective of plenty of money. . . . (436)

Dreiser also argued that the Jew, whatever nation he inhabits, remains principally a Jew, that "he maintains his religious dogmas and his racial sympathies, race characteristics, and race cohesion as against all the types or nationalities surrounding him wheresoever" (437). In brief, his diagnosis is that the Jew possesses undesirable racial characteristics and that there is lit-

tle hope that these will be diminished by assimilation.

Dreiser, however, also provides a remedy—that Jews establish a nation of their own, one where their distinctive characteristics would not stimulate an inevitable anti-Semitic reaction. The Zionist movement had, of course, been active for many years in promoting the idea of a Jewish return to a Palestinian homeland, but Dreiser suggests that any portion of the world will do. The weakness in the German response to the Jewish problem, he implies, is not in their analysis of it but in their substituting the "barbarism" of their persecution of German Jews for a planned resettlement elsewhere.[13] Thus, although Dreiser at this point, as indeed as he was to do for the remainder of his life, criticizes the Nazi mistreatment of Jews, his own analysis of the origin of the Jewish "problem" differs little in its basic thesis from Hitler's racist ideology that the Jew is an undesirable and unassimilable presence within a nation and that he must be dealt with accordingly.

Dreiser's published correspondence with Hapgood caused much consternation, nowhere more than among Communist Party leaders. Although not a member of the party, Dreiser had been a valuable supporter of many of its endeavors and positions since the early 1930s. His argument with Hapgood, however, was disturbing to Communists both because many Jews were party members, especially in New York, and because Dreiser's basic position contradicted official party ideology that social problems stemmed primarily from differences in class and wealth and that anti-Semitic beliefs both obscured this truth and were a means of maintaining control of the masses by an oligarchy. Soon after the *Nation* article appeared, Dreiser was asked to visit the offices of the *New Masses* to receive instruction on this matter; when this meeting did not reach a satisfactory conclusion, a group of party stalwarts visited Dreiser, following which the *New Masses* on 30 April 1935 published an article entitled "Dreiser Denies He Is Anti-Semitic."

The unsigned article is devoted to a point-by-point refutation of Dreiser's argument, to a restatement of Lenin's position regarding the Jews, and to the representation of the Soviet Union as an ideal state for Jews. Its principal interest is the writer's report of the possible origin of Dreiser's beliefs about Jews, that "At the second meeting with the larger group, Dreiser obviously reflected experiences he had with some Jewish lawyers and some Jewish businessmen. He said that in his dealings with them he had met with sharp practices, and this without doubt accounted for his discriminating views in his letters." Dreiser's own words appear only in the form of "Dreiser's Statement" of about 100 words, in which he denied that he made no distinction between the Jewish workingman and the Jewish capitalist and

in which he repudiated any possible use of his letters by Nazi propagandists. "I have no hatred for the Jew," he wrote, "and nothing to do with Hitler or fascism." Although Dreiser apparently wished to make peace with the party and its leaders, he also was not willing to alter his basic beliefs either about the nature of the Jewish presence in American or about the best way to meet the challenge provided by that presence. All he was willing to do, it would appear, was to deny that intense feelings underlay his beliefs and to reject their relationship to events on the world stage.

Mike Gold, the feisty Communist journalist, seems to have recognized that Dreiser was retracting very little, if anything, of the Hapgood exchange. A week after the appearance of "Dreiser Denies He Is Anti-Semitic " in the *New Masses* he published in the same journal "The Gun Is Loaded, Dreiser!" an article reflecting his personal bitterness over Dreiser's views. It had been Gold who had shepherded Dreiser around the East Side years earlier when Dreiser was gathering impressions for *The Hand of the Potter* and in so doing had revealed to Dreiser a world of Jewish poverty and misery. Since Gold devoted almost all his article to further instructing Dreiser in Marxist beliefs regarding the Jews, his piece is of interest primarily for its illustration of his struggle to reconcile the Dreiser who was a great artist and who had fought against oppression of the working class and the Dreiser who expressed anti-Semitic beliefs. This was not an easy task, as many have found who faced an analogous undertaking in relation to other twentieth-century writers, and Gold's solution to the problem is weak and unsatisfactory. Dreiser has anti-Semitic views, he decides, but at heart is not an anti-Semite. And, following up on the title of his piece, Dreiser is like a child with a loaded gun; he may cause immense harm with the weapon, but he is not guilty of evil intent.

These efforts by the Party to cleanse Dreiser of his anti-Semitic beliefs were to no avail. On 27 June 1935, less than two months after Gold's article, he wrote his Russian friend Sergei Dinamov,

> Apart from what I said to the group representing the new *Masses*, I have not changed my viewpoint in regard to the Jewish programme in America. They do not blend as do the other elements in this Country, but retain as they retain in all countries, their race solidarity and even their religion—here particularly. . . . You saw one result of their peculiar race drift in their management of the Movies in this Country. (Elias 2: 747)

During the early and mid-1930s, as Dreiser's ideas about the "peculiar race drift" of the Jews were bringing him an unwanted criticism and notori-

ety, his experience with film companies and publishers appeared to further confirm his position. He came to believe that Universal Studios, headed by Carl Laemmle, Jr., a Jew, had plagiarized his *Jennie Gerhardt* in its 1932 film version of Fannie Hurst's popular novel *Back Street*,[14] and beginning in 1935 he pursued this claim over several years in angry correspondence with Universal and through various lawyers. Horace Liveright, Inc., had failed in early 1933, and in 1934 Dreiser signed a contract with Simon and Schuster for the publication of all his earlier and forthcoming works. The relationship soon soured, however, on much the same grounds as had that with Liveright—that is, Simon and Schuster wished him to produce a promised novel, and Dreiser felt it was stinting on support of his other efforts. Indeed, by the late 1930s he also was claiming that the firm had cheated him by the way it had disposed of copies of his Liveright books which it had acquired. In a letter of 6 May 1939 to his long-time friend and agent William C. Lengel, Dreiser outlined his case against Simon and Schuster, both of whom were Jewish, and then went on to connect what he held to be their shabby and even dishonest treatment of him with

> this constant under-cover talk about my anti-Judaism which consisted of the mild correspondence I once had with Hutchins Hapgood, [and which] has caused all sorts of people who are inimical to me—writers and what not—to not only play this up but exaggerate it in every quarter, so that I feel that Simon and Schuster may themselves be joined with this issue to the end of taking me off the market entirely. It may be that they identify me with Germany and have decided to include me in their campaign against Teutonic Culture.[15]

Writing from Los Angeles to his New York acquaintance Dayton Stoddart a few days later, on 10 May, he asked Stoddart to "get me the names of fairly recently organized non-Jewish publishers. I am thinking of changing from Simon and Schuster. . . " (DPUP).

During this last phase of his career Dreiser continued to speak out publicly against Nazi persecution of the Jews while expressing privately, in correspondence with friends, anti-Semitic beliefs. In 1939, for example, he contributed to the League of American Writers' publication "*We Hold These Truths . . .": Statements on Anti-Semitism by 54 Leading American Writers, Statesmen, Educators, Clergymen and Trade-Unionists.* Yet to Stoddart he wrote on 22 June 1939 from Los Angeles that

> The movies are solidly Jewish. They've dug in, employ only Jews with American names and buy only what they cannot ab-

> stract & disguise. And the dollar sign is the guide—mentally & physically. That America should be led—the mass—by this direction is beyond all believing. In addition they are arrogant, insolent, and contemptuous. (DPUP)

And to H. L. Mencken on 3 October 1939, not long after the German invasion of Poland and the outbreak of World War II, he wrote, "I begin to suspect that Hitler is correct. The President may be part Jewish. His personal animosity toward Hitler has already resulted in placing America in the Allied Camp—strengthening Britains attitudes and injuring Germany in the eyes of the world. The brass!" (Riggio 2: 651). Indeed, in the light of these comments even Dreiser's contribution to the League of American Writers' collection of statements opposing anti-Semitism appears excessively cautious and self-defensive. Dreiser places the persecution of the Jews in a larger context of the persecution of minorities throughout the world, naming Germany and its Jews only once and Hitler not at all. He devotes his final paragraph to the issue of what the "equitable individual" can do to contribute to the "abolishment of these outrages" and states that he himself can do no more than speak out, as "the record of my personal appeals over many years" proves. He concludes, petulantly, "What more would you have me say or do?" (Dreiser, "Statement" 318).

Dreiser's anti-Semitic beliefs were no doubt acquired in the homes, streets, and schoolyards of the small Indiana towns of his youth. He then found the mythic Shylock characterization of the Jew as shrewd, mercenary, and untrustworthy in business matters confirmed by his early encounters with Jews in Chicago. After a period of good will toward Jews fostered by friendships with and admiration of Jewish artists and intellectuals, his earlier beliefs were reconfirmed by dealings with Jewish lawyers, publishers, and film moguls, most of whom he believed to be unscrupulous. He also began to reflect, from the late 1920s onward, the anti-Semitic belief that Jews were both an undesirable and unassimilable element within American society.

Dreiser is not the only American writer to succumb to the widespread anti-Semitism of this period, whether its sources were those of rural ignorance and fear or of racist-based "historical" demonstration. And there is no doubt that he was victimized by Jews on some occasions in business dealings from the late 1920s onward. Unlike many other American writers and intellectuals of his generation who harbored traces of anti-Semitism, however, Dreiser refused to modify these beliefs during the 1930s, when it came to be realized that the former almost reflexive anti-Semitism both of polite society and of working-class America contained a deadly political dimension.

It is not as though Dreiser did not have precise instruction in the danger of his beliefs during this decade from his many admirers who were deeply chagrined by them. This instruction usually was along two lines, one of which is illustrated by an exchange between Dreiser and Ernest Boyd, an urbane literary critic and friend with whom Dreiser was later to collaborate in the editing of the *American Spectator*. At a dinner party give by Boyd in late April 1931, just a month or so after Dreiser's confrontation with Liveright and Lasky over the sale of the film rights of *An American Tragedy*, Dreiser, without realizing that one of the guests was Jewish, made anti-Semitic remarks about Jews in show business. After he wrote to Boyd on 1 May apologizing for introducing "TNT" into the occasion,[16] Boyd replied that his own point of view was that

> Gentiles, trying to run the same racket today, have to and do adopt the same methods. If Hollywood, for example, were controlled by Gentiles but aimed at the same audience and profits, it would be just the same as we see it. Mass production and excess profiteering produce the same results in Jew and Gentile. (DPUP)

Dreiser, however, despite Boyd's not uncommon perception, was never able to make the leap from conclusions based on his own personal experience to those derived from a wider perspective. Jews had treated him shabbily and therefore it was their Jewishness, not the social context in which they functioned, that was to blame.

The second major kind of instruction to which Dreiser failed to respond centered on the danger inherent in his remarks. In his 1 May letter to Boyd, Dreiser wrote, after noting his friendships with a number of Jews, "Nevertheless, I reserve the right to pass criticism on the actions of any portion of any race that I consider detrimental or offensive to me." This reliance on the seeming unassailability of one's personal opinion perhaps had some validity in 1931, but not in 1935, with Hitler firmly in power and with a rabid anti-Semitism rampant throughout the fascist movements of Europe and America, as Dreiser was frequently told—not by his detractors but by his friends and supporters. Hapgood, the *New Masses*, and Gold repeated several times in their 1935 articles on Dreiser's anti-Semitism that his beliefs strongly resembled those of the Nazis and other fascist organizations. For a major American author so strongly identified with the ideals of social justice to express such beliefs was not only a betrayal of those ideals—and hence Hapgood's and Gold's obvious anger—but also an extraordinary failure of political imagination. "I am an individual," Dreiser told the *New*

Masses delegation. "I have a right to say what I please" ("Dreiser Denies"). What Dreiser failed to comprehend was that in the context of the mid-1930s and the specific subject of the Jews, he was not only an individual but also the world-famous author Theodore Dreiser. His ideas in this volatile area carried resonance and weight, and it was therefore necessary for him to accept responsibility for their impact rather than to retreat into the bastion of "personal opinion."

Dreiser's great works had been written by the time his more pronounced anti-Semitism emerged in the late 1920s. He nevertheless remained for the two post-*American Tragedy* decades of his life a major presence on the American cultural scene. There are many strands in that presence, some estimable, some less so, with his anti-Semitism one of the latter.

Notes

1. I refer to *Theodore Dreiser: Interviews*, edited by Frederic E. Rusch and Donald Pizer, to be published by the University of Illinois Press in the fall of 2004; and *Theodore Dreiser: New Letters*, vol. 1, edited by Donald Pizer, to be published by Illinois in the fall of 2005.

2. Perhaps the fullest accounts are by Tuerk and Harap; Tuerk's study, however, is limited to the mid-1930s.

3. The passage has a complicated compositional history, one which bears on the distinction within it between Dreiser's 1891 attitude toward Jews and his later qualification of this attitude. The holograph version of the passage (at the Lilly Library, Indiana University) contains neither the concluding sentence about "the possible beauty of the individual soul" nor the phrases "race prejudice, possibly" and "as I then pictured them to myself." Both the sentence and the phrases were added by Dreiser by hand to the typescript of *Dawn* in Box 243, the Dreiser Papers, University of Pennsylvania Library (hereafter cited as DPUP). Dreiser wrote *Dawn* during 1914–16 and revised it in late 1917, when he had Louise Campbell prepare a typescript of the entire holograph. He wrote to Campbell on 20 October 1917 that "I want first a single rough copy which I can correct and then I want an original and a carbon of the corrected copy" (Campbell 13). Dreiser's letter to George L. Wheelock on 17 November 1920, in which he reports that *Dawn* was typed and "ready" (Elias 1: 301), suggests that the entire revision was completed by that date at the latest. Dreiser then further revised the book in 1930, again with Campbell's aid, in preparation for its 1931 publication by Horace Liveright. These various strands of evidence strongly suggest (but do not conclusively prove) that in revising

the holograph in 1917–18, Dreiser realized that the original passage did not reflect his current ideas about Jews and revised it accordingly. (I am indebted to Stephen Brennan for aid in consulting and interpreting the *Dawn* manuscripts which I refer to.)

4. For a similar view, see Shiff, in Gerber 88.

5. Cahan to Dreiser, 14 December 1921 (DPUP), and Dreiser to Cahan, 23 December 1921, in the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati. Permission to quote from unpublished letters of Dreiser has been granted by the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania.

6. Dreiser to A. Heller, 25 May 1938 (DPUP): "If anyone thinks that basically I am anti-semitic he or she should read *The Hand of the Potter*."

7. Dreiser to A. Heller, 25 May 1938 (DPUP); Dreiser also made this claim in a number of other letters of this period.

8. A similar emphasis on the contribution of immigrant Jews to the spectacle of New York life occurs in Dreiser's chapter "The City Awakes" in *The Color of a Great City* (1923), when he comments on their "adding rich, dark colorful threads to the rug or tapestry which is New York" (6).

9. See Singerman. Many early twentieth-century anti-Semitic ideologues held that Eastern European Jews had a large "Asiatic" genetic component because of Mongol invasions of this area and were therefore unassimilable into European bloodstock.

10. Both Swanberg (306) and Dardis (201) note Dreiser's belief that Lasky and Liveright had conspired in advance of the meeting to keep the price low.

11. Strychacz also discusses the incident (84–89) but principally as a prelude to a lengthy study of Dreiser's use of his newspaper source in the writing of *An American Tragedy*.

12. Dreiser to Anderson, 12 May 1933, in the Newberry Library, Chicago.

13. For Dreiser's similar but more explicit comment on the Nazi treatment of German Jews, see his letter to Heywood Broun, 7 January 1936, in Elias 3: 765.

14. Dreiser to Laemmle, 23 August 1935 (DPUP).

15. Dreiser to Lengel, 6 May 1939, in the William C. Lengel Collection, University of Pennsylvania Library.

16. Dreiser to Boyd, 1 May 1931, in the Beinecke Library, Yale University.

Works Cited

Campbell, Louise, ed. *Letters to Louise: Theodore Dreiser's Letters to Louise Campbell*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1959.

Cohen, Naomi W. "Antisemitism in the Gilded Age: The Jewish View." *Jewish Social Studies* (Summer/Fall 1979); rpt. Gurock 1: 263–86.

Dannenbaum, Raymond. "Theodore Dreiser Discounts Intermarriage." *Jewish Journal* (San Francisco) 3 (4 June 1930): 3, 16.

Dardis, Tom. *Fireband: The Life of Horace Liveright.* New York: Random, 1995.

Dreiser, Theodore. *The Color of a Great City.* New York: Boni and Liveright, 1923.

———. *Dawn.* New York: Horace Liveright, 1931.

———. [Statement on Anti-Semitism.] In *"We Hold These Truths . . .": Statements on Anti-Semitism by 54 Leading American Writers, Statesmen, Educators, Clergymen, and Trade-Unionists.* New York: League of American Writers, 1939; rpt. Donald Pizer, ed. *Theodore Dreiser: A Selection of Uncollected Prose.* Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1977. 317–18.

"Dreiser Denies He Is Anti-Semitic." *New Masses* 15 (30 April 1935): 10.

"Editorial Conference (With Wine)." *American Spectator* 1 (September 1933): 1.

Elias, Robert H., ed. *Letters of Theodore Dreiser: A Selection.* 3 vols. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1959.

Ferkiss, Victor C. "Populist Influences on American Fascism." *Western Political Quarterly* (1957); rpt. Gurlock 1: 301–24.

Gerber, David A., ed. *Anti-Semitism in American History.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1986.

Gold, Mike. "The Gun Is Loaded, Dreiser!" *New Masses* 15 (7 May 1935): 14–15.

Gurock, Jeffrey S., ed. *Anti-Semitism in America.* New York: Routledge, 1998.

Hapgood, Hutchins. "Is Dreiser Anti-Semitic?" *Nation* 140 (17 April 1935): 436–38.

Harap, Louis. "Theodore Dreiser." *Creative Awakening: The Jewish Presence in Twentieth-Century American Literature.* New York: Greenwood, 1987. 128–42.

Higham, John. "Ideological Anti-Semitism in the Gilded Age." *Send These to Me.* New York: Atheneum, 1975. 116–37.

Ish-Kishor, Sulamith. "Theodore Dreiser Looks at the Russian Jews." *The Day* (New York) 10 February 1929: 1.

J[affe], J[ean]. "Dreiser Wants to Know More About Us." *The Day* (New York) 13 April 1924: n.p.

Liptzin, Sol. *The Jew in American Literature.* New York: Bloch, 1966.

Ribuffo, Leo P. "Henry Ford and *The International Jew.*" *American Jewish History* (June 1980); rpt. Gurlock 1: 413–53.

Riggio, Thomas P., ed. *Dreiser-Mencken Letters: The Correspondence of Theodore Dreiser & H. L. Mencken, 1907–1945.* 2 vols. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1986.

Shiff, Ellen. "Shylock's *Mishpocheh*: Anti-Semitism on the American Stage." Gerber 79–99.

Singerman, Robert. "The Jew as Racial Alien: The Genetic Component of American Anti-Semitism." Gerber 103–28.

Skidelsky, Berenice. "America and Her Jews." *Jewish Advocate* (Boston) 5 February 1920: 7; rpt. as " 'As Yeast Added to the Nation's Making': Theodore Dreiser, North American Novelist, Gives His Impression of the Jews." *New York Jewish News* 12 February 1920. [Quotes from this interview are from the *Jewish Advocate*.]

Strychacz, Thomas F. *Modernism, Mass Culture, and Professionalism*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Swanberg, W. A. *Dreiser*. New York: Scribner, 1965.

Synnott, Marcia Graham. "Anti-Semitism and American Universities: Did Quotas Follow the Jews?" Gerber 233-71.

Tuerk, Richard C. "The *American Spectator* Symposium Controversy: Was Dreiser Anti-Semitic?" *Prospects* 16 (1991): 367-89

Business is Business: Corporate America in the Restored *Jennie Gerhardt*

Annemarie Koning Whaley
East Texas Baptist University

In 1911, Harper and Brothers published Theodore Dreiser's second novel, *Jennie Gerhardt*, the story of a poor, self-sacrificing working girl who is twice seduced, first by the fatherly Senator Brander and then, after Brander's sudden death leaves her with an illegitimate child, by the wealthy carriage manufacturer Lester Kane. After several years as Lester's mistress and then as his putative wife in a "parody of a middle-class family" (Pizer 127), she suffers a series of agonizing losses—of father, of lover, of child—and is left gazing down "a vista of lonely years" (418). Upon publication, the novel was criticized by some for its verbosity and distasteful subject matter, but, overall, it received favorable reviews and outsold its predecessor *Sister Carrie.* Over the years, it has been read with appreciation by a number of major critics, including F. O. Matthiessen, who found the novel to contain Dreiser's "most fully realized group" of characters (115), and Donald Pizer, who proclaimed it "one of Dreiser's major achievements" (130). Still, the novel has not sustained the critical interest *Sister Carrie* has, probably because of the taint of sentimentality. Leslie Fiedler no doubt speaks for many readers in declaring Dreiser's fictional world to be "the *absolutely* sentimental world" in which Old Gerhardt, Senator Brander, and Lester Kane are all "weak sons, pleading forgiveness from the eternally offended Jennie-Mother" (253).

In 1992, the novel appeared in "restored" form as a volume in the University of Pennsylvania Dreiser Edition. The copy-text for this edition, its editor James L. W. West III explains, is the "composite MS of 1910–11" ("Editorial" 485), a fair-copy holograph that incorporates portions of the manuscript and typescripts of 1901–02. It is a typescript of this composite, containing his handwritten revisions, that Dreiser first offered unsuccessfully to Macmillan and then sent to Ripley Hitchcock at Harper and

Dreiser Studies • Summer 2004, Vol. 35, No. 1
© 2004 Dreiser Studies

Brothers. Hitchcock persuaded his employers to publish the novel, but only on the condition that the house be allowed to revise and cut the text to make it a more marketable commodity.

While the Harper editors were at work, Dreiser sent a copy of the typescript to H. L. Mencken, his most trusted literary advisor, who praised the book lavishly as "a complete whole" and "at once an accurate picture of life and a searching criticism of life." Despite its great length, Mencken advised Dreiser not to allow cutting: "If any one urges you to cut down the book, bid that one be damned. . . . Let it stand as it is" (Riggio 1: 69). Dreiser, perhaps fearing another *Sister Carrie* fiasco, took this advice only in part, even though his contract gave him the right to find another publisher in case he had a "radical disagreement" with the editing (qtd. in West, "Composition" 435). While Dreiser insisted on restoring some of the 25,000 words cut at first by Hitchcock and his assistants, the text was ultimately reduced by about 16,000 words and the remainder "thoroughly revised and often completely rewritten" (West, "Composition" 441). With significant alterations "in style, characterization, and theme," the original "blunt, carefully documented piece of social analysis" had become "a love story merely set against a social background" (442).[1]

Criticism of the 1911 Harper *Jennie Gerhardt* has in fact concentrated on the love story, but the Pennsylvania Edition has turned critical interest towards the novel as a social document. In the 1995 collection edited by West, *Dreiser's* Jennie Gerhardt: *New Essays on the Restored Text*, contributors address such diverse subjects as the novel's treatment of domestic labor, real estate speculation, hotels, and burial practices. Two contributors, Clare Virginia Eby and Christopher Wilson, discuss the restored text as a critique of industrial capitalism. In an argument developed more fully in her *Dreiser and Veblen, Saboteurs of the Status Quo* (1998), Eby considers Jennie a "perfect Veblenian heroine" whose feminine "instinct of workmanship" (94) and maternal nature set her above the capitalist world that bases status on "invidious comparisons" (97). Similarly, Wilson argues that Old Gerhardt and Archibald Kane serve as a "critique" of Lester and Robert Kane's modern business practices by representing America's antebellum "artisan-based universe," in which labor and capital were related by principles of "republican mutuality" (107).

However, the restored *Jennie Gerhardt* probes more deeply the ethical failings of American business than Eby and Wilson indicate in their relatively brief discussions of conflicting value systems. In the Kane family patriarch Archibald and his oldest son Robert, Dreiser represents the greed and inhumanity of men who not only use others for their own ends but will-

ingly sacrifice their own family members for material success and power. Why Hitchcock and his fellow editors muted Dreiser's original negative portrayal of American capitalism may never be known for certain, but the entanglement of Harper and Brothers in the financial practices condemned in Dreiser's original manuscript offers one possible reason.

Even those critics who have studied the restored text have concentrated largely on Archibald Kane's reputation in his private and business relations for kindness and honesty, qualities that, as already mentioned, Christopher Wilson associates with the artisan virtues of antebellum America and that Arthur D. Casciato identifies with the family's Irish heritage (175–76). Evidence of Archibald's kindness is his attendance of the funeral of "Old Zwingle, the yard watchman at the factory, who had been with Mr. Kane for over forty years" (P140; H148).[2] Being "radically honest" (P 292; H291), he has taught Lester the belief that truth is "the breath of life" and the "basis of real worth" (P293; H291). Consequently, though Lester is confused about most things in life, he is "settled" on one idea—"the need of being honest" (P126; H133). Archibald's virtues, however, dissolve into airy nothing when they conflict with his profit motive.

In both the Harper and Pennsylvania texts, the most glaring example of Archibald's coldness is the way he divides his assets in his revised will. Originally, Archibald plans to leave half of his wealth to his three daughters, and half to his two sons, with Lester and Robert sharing equally in running the company. At some point, however, Archibald changes his mind. He stipulates that Lester's inheritance is to be held in trust by Robert, with Lester receiving only ten thousand dollars a year. Lester has three years to "bring his life into moral conformity with the wishes of his father" (P294; H294) in one of two ways: he can leave Jennie and get his share of stocks and other property, or he can marry her and get the ten thousand a year for the rest of his life. If he continues in his illicit relationship, his entire inheritance will go to Robert. By making Lester's inheritance contingent upon his leaving Jennie, Archibald pressures Lester to put profit before feelings.

In the restored version, Archibald's motives extend beyond moral repugnance at Lester's affair to a growing belief that Lester's sympathetic and somewhat passive nature could harm the company, as is revealed by a discussion among the three Kane men of how to deal with old, unproductive employees:

> Robert was for running the business on a hard and cold basis, dropping the aged, who had grown up with his father, and cleaning out the "dead wood" as he called it. Lester had stood in counsel for a more humane course.

> "I'm not going to see these old fellows who have grown up with this business thrown out bag and baggage, without anything, if I can help it. It isn't right. This house has made money. It can afford to be decent. I know a business has got to be conducted on a hard and fast basis in the main, but this thing of cleaning them all out without anything don't appeal to me. We could afford to get up a pension scheme which would take care of the most deserving. This house has made money."
>
> "There you go, Lester, saddling a new item on the cost of production," protested his brother. "But it isn't wise. This house is in the lead today, but there are other carriage companies. We can't afford to take any more chances or saddle ourselves with any more expense than if we were beginners. The business of this concern is to make money, just as much as it can. . . ."
>
> Nothing was done about this at the time—Kane senior was too kindly to let any radical action be taken—but he was rather inclined to agree with Robert commercially, though sympathetically and ethically he thought that Lester had the more decent end of the argument. . . .
>
> "I like Lester," his brother would reply [to his father's efforts to smooth things over later]. "He's too easy for his own good though. He won't get anywhere by taking the other fellow into consideration."
>
> Kane senior agreed with this also, but he liked Lester's attitude. It was kindly. (P170–171)

In this scene, Robert's cold-blooded profiteering is much more evident than in the Harper text, and Archibald's identification with Lester's "kindly," "humane" attitude clearly is under considerable strain as he finds himself swayed by Robert's argument. Archibald will eventually threaten to deny Lester his birthright not merely because of his moralistic concern for the proprieties but because the bottom line outweighs his benevolent impulses.

The much shorter version of this passage in the Harper edition focuses entirely on the company's business relations and shows Archibald wanting to avoid family strife but not himself suffering a conflict of values:

> Lester was for building up trade through friendly relationships, concessions, personal contact, and favors. Robert was for pulling everything tight, cutting down the cost of production, and offering such financial inducements as would throttle competition.

> The old manufacturer always did his best to pour oil on these troubled waters, but he foresaw an eventual clash. One or the other would have to get out or perhaps both. "If only you two boys could agree!" he used to say. (H177)

In revising the passage, then, the Harper editors minimized the inhumane practices of big business as a theme in the novel.

Given Dreiser's well-known sympathy for America's oppressed workers, it is likely that in the restored text Lester speaks for Dreiser in calling for a "more humane course" of treatment for employees. At the time Dreiser was writing *Jennie Gerhardt*, a working man, such as those employed by the Kane Manufacturing Company, made only 21.6 cents per hour and only $490 per annum. Working conditions were often deplorable and on-site accidents were frequent. In 1913, for instance, 25,000 people died in factory accidents and approximately 700,000 were injured, "more than half the number of American casualties in World War I" (Tindall 766). There were no programs to help displaced employees survive, as most employers felt no obligation to the employee beyond insuring that wages were paid: "The consciousness of power made [the average rich manufacturer] tyrannical, hard, sometimes cruel," writes the economic historian Paul Matoux (qtd. in Heilbroner 57). In *Sister Carrie*, Dreiser had depicted the cruel conditions of a Chicago shoe factory, whose owners had not yet embraced the "new socialism which involves pleasant working conditions for employees" (30), and had sympathized with workingmen exploited by big business during a violent streetcar strike in Brooklyn. Moreover, *An Amateur Laborer* and related texts, which tell of his efforts to recover from his breakdown of 1901–02 by manual labor, indicate his empathy with working men and women, an empathy he originally attributed to Lester. "[H]uman sympathy . . . tenderness" is essential, writes Dreiser. "Without it I would have been helpless—without it unhappy. In so hard and stony a world what else was important?" (*Amateur* 63).

Despite the cuts, the victimization of workers remains an important element in the Harper text. Jennie's father, Old Gerhardt, is a devoted and hardworking employee of a glass manufacturer who is fired after his hands are severely burned in a glass-blowing accident. Without the kind of "pension scheme" suggested by Lester, Old Gerhardt suffers the fate Lester wants to prevent in his own family business; that is, he is an aged worker thrown out "bag and baggage." He is forced to scrounge for odd jobs, and the family must eventually separate to find work. So life altering is the loss of Old Gerhardt's job that Dreiser uses it to complete Jennie's fall from respectability in the eyes of conventional society. She becomes Lester's mis-

tress only because she believes there is no choice. Lester will support them, but only if she agrees to live with him. "Was she doomed to a second sacrifice," she thinks as she looks at her "haggard and distraught" mother (P149; H155). "There really was no alternative. . . ." (P153; H156). It is possible that Old Gerhardt's injury escaped Hitchcock's blue pencil because it is so crucial to the plot. In the restored text, however, it dramatically supports Lester's more abstract human concerns and contributes more obviously to the novel's critique of American industry.

The restored passage in which the Kanes argue over pensions prepares for a later passage that introduces, with only minor differences in the two editions, the possibility that Archibald might change his will. Robert and Lester are discussing whether to "sever relations with an old and well-established paint company in New York which had manufactured paints especially for the house" (P187; H193). Lester believes that the company should be loyal to its past associations while Robert argues, "We can't go on forever standing by old friends, just because Father here has dealt with them or you like them. . . . The business must be hard and strong."[3] Archibald says he is "inclined to think Robert is right," and after this "defeat," Lester "wonder[s] whether his father would discriminate in any way in the ultimate distribution of the property." Convinced that he has "wisely handled" his end of the business," Lester speculates that his father has learned of his "entanglement with Jennie" (P188; H 193–94). But since no one in the Kane family knows of the affair yet, Lester's fears seem baseless, at least in the Harper text. In the Pennsylvania edition, however, this passage continues undercutting our sympathy for Archibald by again emphasizing his greed and inhumanity, which now begins to loom, in Lester's fear of disinheritance, as an ominous fatal force. The passage also moves Dreiser's critique of big business outward, intimating how large corporations, such as the Kane Manufacturing Company, make it impossible for small businesses to compete with larger companies and thus complementing the earlier restored passage on the mistreatment of employees and their families.

The next important restored passage occurs just after Mrs. Kane dies and Archibald moves in with Robert and his family. Now in constant contact with Robert, Archibald, in both the Pennsylvania and Harper texts, thinks Robert "was not a sycophant in any sense of the word but a shrewd, cold, business man, shrewder quite than his brother gave him credit for." And in both texts Archibald has reached the "definite conclusion" to reduce Lester's inheritance because Lester is not as "strong" as he once believed (P273; H274). However, at this point the restored text speaks to Archibald's belief that Robert's ruthlessness, not just Lester's weakness, makes Robert

more capable of running the family business: "Long and close association with Robert, intimate observation of that individual's highly practical if chilly methods had led him to conclude that commercially there was no choice between them" (P274). With this sentence excised, the Harper text leads directly to a more positive view of Robert: "Lester might be the bigger intellectually or sympathetically—artistically and socially there was no comparison—but Robert got commercial results in a silent, effective way" (H275). In the restored version, the words "silent" and "effective" are qualified by the phrase "highly practical if chilly methods" in the preceding sentence and thus more clearly articulate Archibald's recognition of the questionable means by which Robert achieves commercial results. The words "chilly methods" clearly recall the previously discussed restored scene wherein Robert, with his "hard and cold" business practices, has no problem firing loyal, long-time employees to cut down overhead. Also telling in the restored passage is Archibald's feeling that he has "no choice" but to prefer Robert's "chilly" business ethics over Lester's human ones, a preference that once more makes him a less sympathetic character than he is in the Harper text.

As already suggested, one effect of the restored text is an increase in dramatic irony as readers become aware of Archibald's growing preference for Robert while Lester remains ignorant. For him, exclusion from the family business seems to come out of nowhere:

> As he rode he had no suspicion that his father had acted in any way prejudicial to his interests. It had not been so long since they had had their last conversation, and he had been taking his time to think about things, and his father had given him time. No untoward event could have happened since their last conversation. He also felt that he had stood well with the old gentleman, except for his alliance with Jennie, and now that he was dead he felt that he would be properly provided for. . . . Why should there be any discrimination against him? He really did not think it possible. (P294; H293)

The key line, excised from the Harper text, is "No untoward event could have happened since their last conversation," the certainty here indicating a touch of hubris just before the fall readers have come to expect. When the "untoward event"—the change in the will—is revealed, it shocks the entire family, even Robert: "I think the old gentleman has been a little rough in this," Robert explains. "I certainly did not expect him to go as far as that. Certainly as far as I'm concerned some other arrangements would have

been satisfactory" (P297; H296).

In the restored text, the untoward event is logically prepared for. If Archibald were concerned only about Jennie, then likely "other arrangements would have been satisfactory," but we know he is also concerned that Lester, given an equal voice in the company, would speak out for costly measures like pensions for the elderly and employment for loyal suppliers. Numerous attempts to persuade Lester to leave Jennie have ended with Lester's pat answer: "I can't say what I'll do. I'll have to take time and think. I can't decide this offhand" (P278; H279). Archibald could be reasonably certain, therefore, that Lester would take the full three years before he acted, which is exactly what he does. The result of the new will, then, is not only that Lester eventually leaves Jennie but that Robert gets "just what he wanted" (P301)—time to implement his plans for the company without interference from his brother. Much more than in the Harper edition, then, Archibald is a businessman first and a father and friend second.

Other passages in the restored text show that if Archibald had not changed his will Robert would have seized control of the company anyway. Robert is more ambitious and harder working than Lester and has made his mark in the business world long before Archibald's death: "[Robert] was going ahead, making outside investments out of money made by investments he had made before. He was being spoken of as a coming man . . . a budding financial genius" (P186). While the Harper text indicates an emotional distance between the two brothers—they "were outwardly friendly; inwardly they were far apart" (H177)—the parallel passage in the restored text shows an antagonism on Robert's part that promises to issue in hostile action: "Actually Robert was not so anxious to see Lester prosper" (P169). Lester may feel "a secret contempt for his bother's chill, persistent chase of the almighty dollar" (P170; H177), but he never wishes for Robert's failure, nor does he entertain the idea of using Robert to insure his own success.

Robert's callous attitude towards Lester in the restored text becomes strongly evident in the scene discussed above when the Kanes argue over the feasibility of a pension program for elderly employees. Without knowledge of his father's intention to give him control of the company, Robert begins making plans of his own:

> [He] had come to a very definite conclusion in regard to the business and was planning a coup, once his father should die, which would put it all definitely in his hand. . . . Robert's idea was, after mature deliberation, to curry favor with his three sisters, putting them under financial obligation by reason of minor, successful investments he could make for them and so getting them to

> vote their stock through him. If he could pool it all, or sit as their close financial advisor, he would at once reorganize the company to suit himself. He saw himself naturally elected president. He saw visions of a union with several other carriage companies which would make him a magnate. The Kane Carriage Manufacturing Company was now, in its line, already the strongest concern in the country. If he could buy secretly into the stock of several others, he could exercise a powerful influence toward the general combination which he hoped to effect. Time was an essential and agreeable factor to him. He did not at all object to waiting. He was cold, cool, farseeing. . . .
>
> At this time, Robert propounded a scheme . . . to get Lester out of immediate contact with the business. . . . (P188–89)

The term "coup," with its suggestion of violent overthrow, gives a dark cast to Robert's well-thought-out plan to gain sole power over the company. For Robert, his sisters are little more than a means to an end, and his father and brother are merely obstacles in his path to success. In the parallel passage of the Harper text, Robert takes part in a friendly family discussion and seems more a public-relations visionary than a ruthless businessman:

> Later, in this same year Robert came forward with a plan for reorganization in the executive department of the business. He proposed that they should build an immense exhibition and storage warehouse on Michigan Avenue in Chicago. . . . It would be a big advertisement for the house, a magnificent evidence of its standing and prosperity. . . . Robert suggested that Lester should undertake the construction of the new buildings. It would probably be advisable for him to reside in Chicago a part of the time. (H194)

In this Harper revision, it is hard to recognize the Robert of the restored text, who "embodies [a] new, corrupt ideal of the American dream" (Humma 160).

By thus revealing his darker motives, the restored text sets the stage for Robert's wresting control of the company from Lester and his sisters. For instance, while Lester is involved with the new showroom and warehouse project in Chicago, Robert

> was doing his best to push his personal interests, not only through the influence he was bringing to bear upon his sisters but through his reorganization of the factory during his brother's ab-

> sence. It was so easy for him now to gradually replace, one by one, the people who were objectionable to him—to surround himself by degrees with people in responsible positions who were under obligation to him for putting them there. Several men whom Lester was personally fond of were in danger of elimination. But Lester did not hear of this, and Kane senior was inclined to give Robert a free hand. (P223)

This same passage in the Harper text is less damning:

> [Robert] was doing his best to push his personal interests, not only through the influence he was bringing to bear upon his sisters, but through his reorganization of the factory. Several men whom Lester was personally fond of were in danger of elimination. But Lester did not hear of this, and Kane senior was inclined to give Robert a free hand. (H224)

There is more than a hint of insensitivity here, but the revised passage eliminates the worst of Robert's motives—to staff the company with toadies.

This motive is also evident in the restored text when, upon Archibald's death, Robert plans to push his siblings out of the company, install his sycophantic brother-in-law as vice-president, and monopolize carriage manufacturing. In both texts, Robert thinks that "Lester must come to his senses, or he must let Robert run the business to suit himself" (P301; H299). The restored text continues with this sentence:

> Anyhow, with his sisters' stock being voted by him, and his father's admonition to them that they should leave him in control, he could command the situation whether Lester chose to reform or not. Amy's husband as vice president would be a stool pigeon. (P301)

Here, Robert's desire that Lester "come to his senses" is a minor concern. Even if Archibald had not changed his will, Robert has so secured his authority that he "could command the situation whether Lester chose to reform or not." In contrast, the Harper text portrays Robert as an aggressive businessman, but not so aggressive that he would manipulate his own family to increase his power and wealth. As a representative of the corporate world, he has had his image cleaned up considerably.

In general, then, it can be seen that the restored passages sharpen the opposition between Lester and Robert, which is among the many stark opposi-

tions in the novel that reveal America's social, moral, and economic contradictions. There are, for instance, Jennie's romanticism and Lester's mechanistic determinism; the wealth of the Kanes and the poverty of the Gerhardts; the opulence of the Columbus hotel where Senator Brander lives and the shabbiness of the rented house where the Gerhardts struggle for existence; the intelligence and political influence of Brander and the superstitious religiosity and dependence of the Gerhardts. In the restored text, Robert is a single-minded materialist whose priorities never waver. On the other hand, Lester, though apathetic and sometimes heartless, such as when he leaves Jennie for Lettie Pace, remains a deeply divided man who struggles to choose between two opposing and equally attractive worlds. He naturally gravitates towards Jennie because she shares his feelings and sympathies. In the end, he is miserable because he has denied his essential nature and, on his deathbed, wishes he had lived a different kind of life.

In establishing this opposition, Dreiser had originally gone into considerable detail about Robert's "coup," his immersion in the dirty business of creating a monopoly, or trust, in carriage manufacturing. Such combines, explains historian Robert L. Heilbroner, were an avenue by which the wealthy "used their power to raise prices[,] . . . magnify profits [and] . . . stifle enterprise" (197). Trusts were so destructive that by the end of the nineteenth century anti-trust legislation (most notably the Sherman Anti-Trust Act) was passed to keep monopolies from destroying healthy competition. One reason for such legislation was the public outrage created by the muck-rakers. "Investigative journalists," writes Jean Strouse, "documented abuses of power at all levels of American society, but the paramount villain in the popular imagination was Big Business and its apotheosis, the trust." In addition, she states, novelists like Dreiser, Norris, London, and Sinclair "added to the graphic picture of a nation ravaged by predatory capital" (455).

While Strouse probably has in mind the detailed account of big business in the Cowperwood trilogy, the restored *Jennie Gerhardt* is also a "graphic picture" of capitalistic predation. Robert wants to put as many competitors out of business as he can: "Armed with the voting power of the entire stock of the company and therefore with the privilege of hypothecating its securities, he laid before several of his intimate friends in the financial world his scheme of uniting the principle carriage companies and controlling the trade" (P321). Although both the Harper and Pennsylvania texts state that Robert's plan "would have every little manufacturer by the throat" (P327; H326), only the restored text explains that Robert's trust will cost thousands of workers their jobs: "Where possible, duplication of effort was to be

eliminated, and salesman, buyers, laborers to be cut down to the minimum necessary to do the actual work. Useless plants would be eliminated or run on part-time only." Robert has no loyalty to the family business, for, as he tells a prospective fellow conspirator, "if it will save money, we will shut up the Kane company . . . and let the other plants do the work" (P322). Instead of buying lumber in America, the new trust will buy it from "foreign countries" and thereby "cut the cost of manufacture by nearly seven per cent" (P323). In the end, Robert becomes president of the largest and most powerful carriage manufacturing company in the world, and although he attempts later to bring Lester back into the fold, it is only after he has insured his own control in the industry: "Robert had things very much in his own hands now anyway and could afford to be generous" (P349; H351). The irony of this "generous" offer is evident in both texts, but only in the restored text does it resonate with the suffering of thousands.

Clearly, the cuts and emendations made to the Harper edition soften Dreiser's treatment of American capitalism at the turn of the century. Hitchcock may have eliminated so much detail about business simply to shorten what he took to be an overly long manuscript. However, the financial problems facing Harper and Brothers at the time may also have played a role. Once a financial powerhouse, the firm had, by 1899, "become desperate" (Madison 72) because of a shift in leadership following the death or retirement of the first two generations of Harper brothers. According to Strouse, "The book division was earning no profit, the English office had closed . . . and the magazine was losing advertising and circulation" (365–66). Unable to repay extensive loans, the firm was saved by J. Pierpont Morgan, who pumped some seven and a half million dollars of stocks, bonds, and cash into the ailing business (365–66). Morgan placed his own man, George M. Harvey, in charge of the reorganization. When Harvey employed many of the same harsh methods proposed by Robert Kane, Harper family members who had been with the firm their entire lives were forced into retirement, and smaller publishing houses were bought up and folded into the Harper business (Madison 169). Modernization was no respecter of persons, as compositors, "men grown old in the business" (Exman 188), were replaced with machines.

Although Morgan did not "expect profit or editorial influence" (Strouse 366), he would not have appreciated Harper using his funds to publish a negative picture of his own business practices, especially since there was, at this time, such "a profound national shudder of revulsion against big business" (453). He might have been especially sensitive to Dreiser's original harsh treatment of monopolies, for only a year after the publication of

Jennie Gerhardt the house of Morgan would face a congressional investigation into what trustbuster Louis D. Bandeis called its "monopolistic and predatory control over the financial and industrial resources of the country" (qtd. in Chernow 176). By softening the harsh but realistic portrait of Archibald and Robert Kane, therefore, Hitchcock perhaps wished to divert attention from the novel's indictment of big business, and, by extension, of Harper and Brothers and the House of Morgan.

For Dreiser's most realistic portrait of ruthless American capitalism outside the Cowperwood trilogy, readers should turn to the Pennsylvania Edition of *Jennie Gerhardt*. In the Harper text, the Kanes, especially Archibald and Robert, are, if not warm-hearted, at least not entirely ruled by cold-blooded materialism. In the restored text, while the novel's heroine "doesn't want much" (P373; H378), Archibald and Robert want as much money and power as they can get, regardless of the health and welfare of others. They emerge as Dreiser first portrayed them, as representatives of the "chilly methods" of American business.

Notes

1. Specifically, West points out, the editors cut profanity and most references to sex, alcohol, and the church. These cuts, he says, were "an intentional effort by Harper to 'socialize' or 'domesticate' Dreiser's novel for public consumption" ("Composition" 444). According to West, the most glaring problem with the Harper edition is that Jennie loses her place as the central character as "Lester and his point of view come to dominate the novel" (446). Though he offers general observations about the Harper text's "sparser social background" (450), West does not explore how the cuts affected the novel's treatment of business.

2. P indicates the Pennsylvania Edition; H, the Harper Edition. A parenthetical citation of P or H by itself means that the passage does not appear in the other edition.

3. In the Harper edition, this last line was emended to read, "The business must be stiffened up; we're going to have more and stronger competition" (H 622).

Works Cited

Casciato, Arthur D. "How German Is *Jennie Gerhardt*?" West, ed. 167–82.

Chernow, Ron. *The House of Morgan: An American Banking Dynasty and the Rise of Modern Finance*. New York: Grove, 2000.

Dreiser, Theodore. *An Amateur Laborer*. Ed. Richard W. Dowell and James L. W. West III. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1983.

———. *American Diaries 1902–1926*. Ed. Thomas P. Riggio. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1982.

———. *Jennie Gerhardt*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1911.

———. *Jennie Gerhardt*. Ed. James L. West III. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1992.

———. *Sister Carrie*. Ed. Donald Pizer. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1991.

Eby, Clare Virginia. "Jennie Through the Eyes of Thorstein Veblen." West, ed. 91–102.

Exman, Eugene. *The House of Harper: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Publishing*. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Fiedler, Leslie. *Love and Death in the American Novel*. Rev. ed. New York: Stein and Day, 1975.

Heilbroner, Robert L. *The Quest for Wealth: The Study of Acquisitive Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1956.

Humma, John B. "*Jennie Gerhardt* and the Dream of the Pastoral." West, ed. 157–66.

Madison, Charles A. *Book Publishing in America*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Matthiessen, F. O. *Theodore Dreiser*. American Men of Letters Series. New York: William Sloane, 1951.

Pizer, Donald. *The Novels of Theodore Dreiser*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1976.

Riggio, Thomas P., ed. *Dreiser-Mencken Letters*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1986.

Strouse, Jean. *Morgan: American Financier*. New York: HarperCollins, 2000.

Tindall, George Brown. *America: A Narrative History*. New York: Norton, 1984.

West, James L. W. III. "The Composition and Publication of *Jennie Gerhardt*." Dreiser, *Jennie Gerhardt* (1992) 419–95.

———. "Editorial Principles." Dreiser, *Jennie Gerhardt* (1992) 485–96.

———, ed. Jennie Gerhardt: *New Essays On the Restored Text*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1995.

Wilson, Christopher P. "Labor and Capital in *Jennie Gerhardt*." West, ed. 103–114.

A Dreiser Checklist, 2000–2001

Roger W. Smith

This checklist supplements *Theodore Dreiser: A Primary Bibliography and Reference Guide*, by Donald Pizer, Richard W. Dowell, and Frederic E. Rusch (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1991). It attempts to include all significant primary and secondary works published in the years 2000 through 2001. This bibliography will also be published on the *Dreiser Studies* website: <http://www.uncw.edu/dreiser/studies/>.

As was the case with past checklists, this update does not include publications in which Dreiser is given only passing mention, nor does it include reviews of secondary sources. It does, however, include articles that contain nuggets of biographical detail (no matter how slight) that are not derivative, personal reminiscences about Dreiser, or excerpts from Dreiser's correspondence and books and articles that include brief original critical insight or comment on Dreiser or his works. When the relevance to Dreiser is not otherwise clear from the title, items receive brief annotations. Internet publications are not included.

For cross-referencing, each item in the checklist is preceded by an alphanumeric or numeric identifier that essentially follows the system used by Pizer, Dowell, and Rusch in *Theodore Dreiser: A Primary Bibliography and Reference Guide*. For book reviews, cross-references are provided parenthetically after the title of the book being reviewed. For reprints and collections of essays, they follow the complete citation. Publications by or about Dreiser (including translations of his works) in languages other than English have not been cited. They will be covered in a future update. I wish to thank Sheila Gair, Andrew Gross, James Harbeck, and Tanya Whelan for helpful responses to inquiries.

© 2004 Dreiser Studies

Writings by Theodore Dreiser

2000

A. Books, Pamphlets, Leaflets, and Broadsides

A2000.1. Dreiser, Theodore. *An American Tragedy*. Intro. Richard Lingeman. Signet Classics. New York: New American Library, 2000.

A2000.2———. *Sister Carrie*. Intro. Richard Lingeman. Special Centennial Edition. Signet Classics. New York: New American Library, 2000. Reprints the 1900 Doubleday text.

AA. Collected Editions

AA2000.1 Dreiser, Theodore. *The Collected Plays of Theodore Dreiser*. Ed. Keith Newlin and Frederic E. Rusch. Albany, NY: Whitston, 2000.

D. Miscellaneous Separate Publications

D2000.1. Dreiser, Theodore. "The Bowery Mission." *The Red Badge of Courage; Maggie, A Girl of the Streets; and Other Selected Writings: Complete Texts with Introduction, Historical Contexts, Critical Essays*. Ed. Phyllis Frus and Stanley Corkin. New Riverside Editions. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000. 161–66. Reprint of A23-1.

D2000.2. ———. "The Country Doctor." *An American Album: One Hundred and Fifty Years of Harper's Magazine*. Ed. Lewis H. Lapham and Ellen Rosenbush. New York: Franklin Square, 2000. 210–16. Reprint of C18-5.

D2000.3. ———. "Free." *Anthology of American Literature, Seventh Edition; Volume II: Realism to the Present*. Ed. George McMichael, et al. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000. 915–37. Reprint of C18-2.

D2000.4. ———. "The Lost Phoebe." *The American Short Story and Its Writer: An Anthology*. Ed. Ann Charters. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000. 593–605. Reprint of C16-4.

D2000.5. ———. " 'No Sale, A Story' by Theodore Dreiser, Presented in Memory of Neda M. Westlake." Ed. and intro. by Thomas P. Riggio. *Dreiser Studies* 31:1 (2000): 17–25.

D2000.6. ———. *The Titan*. Read by Stuart Langston. Cassette tape. Ashland, OR: Blackstone Audiobooks, 2000.

D2000.7. Huston, James A., ed. *A Hoosier Sampler: An Anthology of Indiana Writers*. Lanham, MD: UP of America, 2000. 215–16, 451–76. Contains excerpts from *An American Tragedy*. Also includes the lyrics

of "On the Banks of the Wabash, Far Away" by Dreiser's brother Paul Dresser, with a brief discussion of Dreiser's probable contribution to writing the lyrics and the circumstances under which the song was written.

D2000.8. Sandweiss, Lee Ann, et al., eds. *Seeking St. Louis: Voices from a River City, 1670–2000*. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society P, 2000. Contains excerpt from Dreiser's *A Book About Myself* and three newspaper stories attributed to Dreiser: "Bread War in Little Russia," *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* 10 Feb. 1893 (reprinted in D88-1); "The Trouble Still On," *St. Louis Republic* 20 June 1893 (C93-54; reprinted in D88-1); and "Under the Wheels," *St. Louis Republic* 6 Jan. 1894 (C94-5; reprinted in D88-1).

D2000.9. Weinmann, Christopher John. "Dreiser's 'Lost Decade': Five Unpublished Stories." Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State U, 2000. *DAI* 61.8 (2001): 3177A. Examines, and provides text of, five unpublished short stories that were most likely written by Dreiser in the period 1904–1909: (1) "The Sailor Who Would Not Sail"; (2) an untitled story which Weinmann has titled "Business"; (3) "The Virtues of Abner Nail"; (4) an untitled story which Weinmann has titled "McHaig"; (5) "De Lusco." (See also 2000.63).

2001

D. Miscellaneous Separate Publications

D2001.1. Dreiser, Theodore. *Art, Music, and Literature, 1897–1902*. Ed. Yoshinobu Hakutani. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2001. Reprint of C97-16, C98-12, C98-4, C98-13, C98-15, C98-18, C98-21, C98-22, C98-24, C98-26, C98-29, C98-42, C98-43, C98-52, C99-10, C99-11, C99-12, C99-13, C99-14, C99-16, C99-27, C99-29, C99-33, C99-34, C99-40, C99-44, C99-45, C99-48, C00-3, C00-15, C01-5, C01-12, C02-5.

D2001.2. ———. *The Best Short Stories of Theodore Dreiser*. Intro. Howard Fast. Mattituck, NY: Amereon, 2001. Reprint of D47-1.

D2001.3. ———. "The Lost Phoebe." *Something Old, Something New: Short Stories Past and Present*. Cassette tape. Fort Lee, NJ: Lend-a-Hand Society, 2001.

D2001.4. Sawyers, June Skinner, ed. *The Greenwich Village Reader: Fiction, Poetry, and Reminiscences, 1872–2002*. New York: Cooper Square, 2001. 51–78. Contains excerpts from *The "Genius"* (A15-1).

G. Productions and Adaptations

G2001.1. *A Place in the Sun.* Film. Dir. George Stevens. Hollywood: Paramount Home Video, 2001. Re-release of G51-2 in DVD format.

Writings About Theodore Dreiser

2000

2000.1. Armstrong, Heather Stewart. "City Consciousness: A Comparison of Cather's *The Song of the Lark* and Dreiser's *Sister Carrie*." *Willa Cather's New York: New Essays on Cather in the City.* Ed. Merrill Maguire Skaggs. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP; London: Associated UP, 2000. 257–65.

2000.2. Barabash, Christina Jean. "A Girl's Guide to Cultural Capital: The American Gold Digger, 1900–1950." Master's thesis, U of Alberta, Canada, 2000. *MAI* 40.1 (2002): 41. Traces the emergence of the gold digger as a recognizable figure in twentieth-century American culture. Chapter 2 discuses the prototypical gold digger as presented in Dreiser's *Sister Carrie.*

2000.3. Bardeleben, Renate von. "Dreiser's Diaristic Mode." *Dreiser Studies* 31.1 (2000): 26–42.

2000.4. ———. "From Travel Guide to Autobiography: Recovering the Original of *A Traveler at Forty.*" Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 177–86.

2000.5. Barcus, James E. "More Light on Dreiser's Chester Gillette/Clyde Griffiths Family." *English Language Notes* 38.1 (2000): 68–73.

2000.6. Blaise, Clark. *Time Lord: Sir Sandford Fleming and the Creation of Standard Time.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2000; New York: Pantheon, 2001. Published in Canada as *Time Lord: The Remarkable Canadian Who Missed His Train, and Changed the World.* Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2000. 232–37. Uses railroad travel as described in *Sister Carrie* as basis for a brief discussion of implied themes related to speed, force, female vs. male sexuality, and their implications for traditional morality at the turn of the century.

2000.7. "Blocked: The Novelist's Experience in Hollywood." Santa Monica, CA: American Movie Classics, 2000. Documentary cable television program. Covers Dreiser's suit against Paramount Studios over changes made in the 1931 film version of *An American Tragedy.*

2000.8. Bramen, Carrie Tirado. "Dreiser and the Spectacle of Extremes." *The Uses of Variety: Modern Americanism and the Quest for National*

Distinctiveness. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2000. 182–87 passim.

2000.9. Brennan, Stephen C. "Introduction, Neda Westlake Memorial Issue." *Dreiser Studies* 31.1 (2000): 2–4.

2000.10. ———. "Sadomasochistic Fantasy in 'The Second Choice.' " *Dreiser Studies* 31.1 (2000): 43–62.

2000.11. ———. "This Sex Which Is One: Language and the Masculine Self in *Jennie Gerhardt*." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 138–57.

2000.12. Brezina, Jennifer Costello. "Public Women, Private Acts: Gender and Theater in Turn-of-the-Century American Novels." *Separate Spheres No More: Gender Convergence in American Literature, 1830–1930*. Ed. Monika M. Elbert. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2000. 225–42. Explores how the use of theater in both setting and metaphor reflects the cultural impact that changing roles for women were having on society as reflected in Dreiser's *Sister Carrie*, Paul Laurence Dunbar's *The Sport of the Gods*, Frank Norris's *The Pit*, and Ellen Glasgow's *Phases of an Inferior Planet*.

2000.13. Butler, Robert. "Urban Frontiers, Neighborhoods, and Traps: The City in Dreiser's *Sister Carrie*, Farrell's *Studs Lonigan*, and Wright's *Native Son*." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 274–90.

2000.14. Clasby, Nancy Tenfelde. "Naturalism and the Orphan Archetype: Dreiser, London, and Crane." *New Jerusalem: Myth, Literature, and the Sacred*. Scranton, PA: U of Scranton P, 2000. 105–23. Discusses treatment of the orphan archetype in Dreiser's story "The Second Choice," pp. 109–11.

2000.15. Cuoco, Lorin, and William H. Gass, eds. *Literary St. Louis: A Guide*. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society P, 2000. 88–95, 250–51.

2000.16. Doenecke, Justus D. *Storm on the Horizon: The Challenge to American Intervention, 1939–1941*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000. 190, 191, 194, 195. Contains a few scattered references to Dreiser's anti-interventionist and anti-British views, mostly drawing upon Dreiser's *America Is Worth Saving* (A41-1) as a source and also on a 1940 Dreiser speech to American Peace Mobilization (see A40-5 and C40-11).

2000.17. Donovan, Nancy M. "Representing Grace Brown: The Working-Class Woman in 'American Tragedy' Murder Narratives." *Dreiser Studies* 31.2 (2000): 3–21.

2000.18. Elder, Shane, and Stephen C. Brennan. "A Dreiser Checklist,

1992." *Dreiser Studies* 31.1 (2000): 63–66.

2000.19. ———. "A Dreiser Checklist, 1993–1997." *Dreiser Studies* 31.2 (2000): 39–57.

2000.20. Frederickson, Kathy. "Working Out to Work Through: Dreiser in Muldoon's Body Shop of Shame." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 115–37.

2000.21. Gair, Sheila. "*Sister Carrie* Theodore Dreiser." *MC²: Journal of Mensa Canada Communications* 33.4 (2000): 9. A retrospective review.

2000.22. Gammel, Irene, and Henry Srebrnik. "Re/Visiting Russia with Theodore Dreiser." Review-essay of *Dreiser's Russian Diary* (A96.2). *Resources for American Literary* Study 26.1 (2000): 110–15.

2000.23. Gelb, Arthur, and Barbara Gelb. *O'Neill: Life with Monte Cristo.* New York and London: Applause, 2000. 428, 508–9, 561–62, 625.

2000.24. Gerber, Philip. "Jolly Mrs. Yerkes Is Home from Abroad: Dreiser and the Celebrity Culture." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 79–103.

2000.25. ———. "Stopping By at Neda's." *Dreiser Studies* 31.1 (2000): 5–12. Contains reminiscences of Neda M. Westlake, curator of the University of Pennsylvania Library's Dreiser collection.

2000.26. Gogol, Miriam. "Interlocking, Intermeshing Fantasies: Dreiser and *Dearest Wilding*." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 187–202.

2000.27. Hakutani, Yoshinobu. "*Sister Carrie*: Novel and Romance." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 23–38.

2000.28. ———, ed. *Theodore Dreiser and American Culture: New Readings*. Newark, DE: U of Delaware P; London: Associated U Presses, 2000. Contains 2000.4, 2000.11, 2000.13, 2000.20, 2000.24, 2000.26, 2000.27, 2000.29, 2000.30, 2000.34, 2000.41, 2000.43, 2000.52, 2000.54, 2000.64, 2000.66.

2000.29. ———. "Wright, Dreiser, and Spatial Narrative." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 248–73.

2000.30. Hapke, Laura. "Men Strike, Women Sew: Gendered Labor Worlds in Dreiser's Social Protest Art." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 104–14.

2000.31. Harmon, Charles. "Cuteness and Capitalism in *Sister Carrie*." *American Literary Realism* 32.2 (2000): 125–39.

2000.32. Hilfer, Anthony Channell. "The Small Town in American Realism." *American Realism*. The Greenhaven Press Companion to Literary Movements and Genres. Ed. Christopher Smith. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven, 2000. 171–72.

2000.33. Hogue, Beverly Jean. "From Primeval Forest to Machine in the Garden: Narratives of Nature in the Old Northwest." Ph.D. dissertation, Bowling Green State U, 2000. *DAI* 61.12 (2001): 4774A. Chapter V contains a section entitled "Hidden Gardens: Dreiser's Urban Wilderness," focusing on *Jennie Gerhardt*.

2000.34. Hussman, Lawrence E. "Expansive and Unmanageable Desire in American Fiction: From 'Naturalism' to Postmodernism." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 214–33.

2000.35. Karaganis, Joseph. "Naturalism's Nation: Toward *An American Tragedy*." *American Literature* 72.1 (2000): 153–80.

2000.36. Lehan, Richard, Donald Pizer, and James L. W. West III. "Reminiscences." *Dreiser Studies* 31.1 (2000): 13–16. Reminiscences of Neda M. Westlake, curator of the University of Pennsylvania Library's Dreiser collection.

2000.37. Lewis, Charles R. "Desire and Indifference in *Sister Carrie*: Neoclassical Economic Anticipations." *A Coincidence of Wants: The Novel and Neoclassical Economics*. Literary Criticism and Cultural Theory: The Interaction of Text and Society. New York: Garland, 2000. 23–25, 127–44. Includes reprint of 98.31.

2000.38. Lingeman, Richard. Introduction to Signet Classic *An American Tragedy* (A2000.1). vii–xv.

2000.39. ———. Introduction to Signet Classic *Sister Carrie* (A2000.2). ix–xviii.

2000.40. Moddelmog, William E. "Theodore Dreiser's Progressive Nostalgia." *Reconstituting Authority: American Fiction in the Province of the Law, 1880–1920*. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 2000. 190–219. Discusses *The Financier* and *The Titan* in terms of their narrative modes and their complicated treatments (at once critical and celebratory) of the business world. See also Moddelmog, "Reconstituting Authority: American Fiction in the Province of the Law, 1880–1920" (97.20).

2000.41. Moyer, Marsha S. "Dreiser, *Sister Carrie*, and Mrs. Doubleday: Gender and Social Change at the Turn of the Century." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 39–55.

2000.42. Mulligan, Roark. "Running with Diana: Dreiser's Hunt of American Endogamy." *American Literary Realism* 32.2 (2000): 140–51.

2000.43. Murayama, Kiyohiko. " 'But a Single Point in a Long Tragedy': *Sister Carrie*'s Equivocal Style." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 65–78.

2000.44. Oakes, Donald T. Afterword to Arthur Henry, *The House in the Woods* (1904). Hensonville, NY: Black Dome, 2000. 155–96. Provides a detailed biographical sketch of Dreiser's friend Arthur Henry. Includes information about Henry's first two wives, Maude (Wood) Henry and Anna (Mallon) Henry, that is pertinent to Dreiser's biography as well as Henry's. Discusses at length the circumstances of and vicissitudes in the Dreiser-Henry relationship.

2000.45. Parisier, Nicole Heidi. "Novel Work: Theater and Journalism in the Writing of Theodore Dreiser, Edith Wharton, and Willa Cather." Ph. D. dissertation, Yale U, 2000. *DAI* 61.10 (2001): 4054A.

2000.46. Perry, Imani. "Dusky Justice: Race in United States Law and Literature, 1878–1914." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard U, 2000. *DAI* 61.5 (2000): 1843A. Examines ways in which American authors opposed Jim Crow and other racially stigmatizing laws. Authors discussed include Charles Chesnutt, Albion Tourgee, Mark Twain, Alice Dunbar Nelson, Dreiser, and Kate Chopin.

2000.47. Pizer, Donald. *Literary Masters: Theodore Dreiser*. Gale Study Guides to Great Literature 7. Farmington Hills, MI: Gale Group, 2000.

2000.48. ———. Review of *The Collected Plays of Theodore Dreiser* (AA2000.1). *Dreiser Studies* 31.2 (2000): 58–59.

2000.49. Prebel, Julie Elizabeth. "Domestic Mobility in the American Post-Frontier, 1890–1900." Ph.D. dissertation, U of Washington, 2000. *DAI* 61.3 (2000): 989A. Examines how themes of domesticity intersect with tropes of mobility in late nineteenth-century literature and culture. "Domestic Mobility, Ideology, and the New Woman in Burnham's *Sweet Clover: A Romance of the White City* and Dreiser's *Sister Carrie*" (thesis chapter).

2000.50. Preston, Claire. *Edith Wharton's Social Register*. London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's, 2000. 94, 128–29 passim. Makes some comparisons to Dreiser's "Trilogy of Desire" in discussing the money-novel as exemplified by Wharton's *The Custom of the Country*.

2000.51. Review of *Twelve Men* (A98.3). *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 36.4 (2000): 453.

2000.52. Riggio, Thomas P. "Dreiser, Fitzgerald, and the Question of Influence." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 234–47.

2000.53. ———. "Dreiser's Song of Innocence and Experience: The Ur-Text of *Jennie Gerhardt*." *Dreiser Studies* 31.2 (2000): 22–38.

2000.54. St. Jean, Shawn. "Dreiser and Literary Paganism: A Reading of the Trilogy of Desire." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 203–13.

2000.55. Schleifer, Ronald. "Analogy beyond Intelligence: Dreiser, Mailer, and the Nature of Intertextuality." *Analogical Thinking: Post-Enlightenment Understanding in Language, Collaboration, and Interpretation*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2000. 155–78. Provides intertextual readings of Dreiser's *An American Tragedy* and Mailer's *The Executioner's Song*. Revision of 1989.28.

2000.56. Schrader, Richard J., ed. *H. L. Mencken: A Documentary Volume*. Dictionary of Literary Biography 222. Farmington Hills, MI: Gale, 2000. 213–20.

2000.57. Sehlinger, Peter J., and Holman Hamilton. *Spokesman for Democracy: Claude G. Bowers, 1878–1958*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society P, 2000. 39, 101, 146–47 passim. Provides a few details about the relationship between Bowers and Dreiser. (See also 1962.3.)

2000.58. Smith, Larry. "The American Working Class Short Story." *The Columbia Companion to the Twentieth-Century American Short Story*. Ed. Blanche H. Gelfant and Lawrence Graver. New York: Columbia UP, 2000. 84. "Though Dreiser's stories may seem to modern readers plodding and dense with detail, they are well-crafted portraits of American life, focused more on theme than the easy charm of popular fiction, and they take the reader inside the characters' experiences and points of view."

2000.59. Sorel, Edward, "—Fifty-fifty." *New Yorker* 25 Dec. 2000–1 Jan. 2001: 110–11. Recounts incident (described by Bennett Cerf in 1977.5) in which Dreiser threw coffee in publisher Horace Liveright's face in a dispute over the sale of screen rights to *An American Tragedy*.

2000.60. Springer, John Parris. *Hollywood Fictions: The Dream Factory in American Popular Literature*. Oklahoma Project for Discourse and Theory 19. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 2000. 137–38. Comments on Dreiser's criticisms of the film industry, particularly the sexual exploitation of aspiring female actresses in a series of articles by Dreiser entitled "Hollywood: Its Morals and Manners" that appeared in *Shadowland* in 1921–22 (C21-9, C21-11, C22-2, C22-4). States that "Dreiser's claims remain largely unsupported by corroborating details."

2000.61. Stansell, Christine. *American Moderns: Bohemian New York and the Creation of a New Century*. New York: Henry Holt, 2000. passim. Provides a few mentions of Dreiser and tidbits of biographical detail.

Useful for information about the Greenwich Village circles in which he moved.

2000.62. Trilling, Lionel. "Reality in America." *The Moral Obligation To Be Intelligent: Selected Essays*, Ed. Leon Wieseltier. New York: Farrar, 2000. 71–86. Reprint of 1950.20.

2000.63. Weinmann, Christopher John. "Dreiser's 'Lost Decade': Five Unpublished Stories." Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State U, 2000. *DAI* 61.8 (2001): 3177A. Examines, and provides text of, five unpublished short stories that were most likely written by Dreiser in the period 1904–1909. Also focuses on Dreiser's work as an editor of popular magazines at the time, arguing that he did not sacrifice his principles for financial security, but rather worked both publicly and privately to pursue cultural and social questions important to him. (See also D2000.9.)

2000.64. West, James L. W. III. "Alcohol and Drinking in *Sister Carrie*." Hakutani 2000.28, pp. 56–64.

2000.65. Westlake, Neda M. Preface to Arthur Henry, *The House in the Woods* (2000.44). ix–xi. Discusses Henry's relationship with Dreiser and alludes to Dreiser's retaliatory (and unflattering) portrait of Henry as a thinly disguised character in his story "Rona Murtha" (in *A Gallery of Women*).

2000.66. Whaley, Annemarie Koning. "Obscuring the Home: Textual Editing and Dreiser's *Jennie Gerhardt*." Hakutani 2000.28, pp 161–76.

2000.67. ———. "Silencing Dreiser: Textual Editing and Theodore Dreiser's *Jennie Gerhardt*." Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State U, 2000. *DAI* 61.7 (2001): 2724A.

2000.68. Young, Philip. "American Fiction, American Life." *American Fiction, American Myth.* University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2000. 257–70. Reprint of talk given to Peace Corps volunteers in 1962. Asserts that the twentieth-century American novel began with Dreiser's *Sister Carrie*.

2000.69. Zimmerman, David Andrew. "Frenzied Fictions: The Writing of Panic in the American Marketplace, 1873–1913." Ph.D. dissertation, U of California, Berkeley, 2000. *DAI* 62.1 (2001): 178A. Chapter 2, "The Fictional Uses of Financial Panic," examines panic fiction of Robert Barr, Edward Lefèvre, Frederic Isham, Upton Sinclair, and Dreiser (*The Financier*) and elaborates the cultural, political, and philosophical uses to which these writers put their depictions of financial panics.

2001

2001.1. Amano, Kyoko. "Alger's Shadows: Re-Considering the American Dream." Ph.D. dissertation, State U of New York at Binghamton, 2001. *DAI* 62.12 (2002): 4162A. Examines the influence of Horatio Alger Jr.'s novels (and the myth that arises from them) on writers including Dreiser.

2001.2. Bausum, Dolores. *Threading Time: A Cultural History of Threadwork*. Fort Worth: TCU P, 2001. 163–64. Briefly discusses Carrie Meeber's job seeking and work experiences in Chicago in *Sister Carrie* in the context of opportunities for needlework available to woman workers at the time.

2001.3. Bell, Michael Davitt. "African-American Writing, 'Protest' and the Burden of Naturalism: The Case of *Native Son*." *Culture, Genre, and Literary Vocation: Selected Essays on American Literature*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2001. 189–215. Briefly notes the literary debt of novelist Richard Wright to Dreiser and discusses how later writers and critics, including Irving Howe and Ralph Ellison, have argued over the extent and implications of this influence.

2001.4. Brennan, Stephen C. Review of *Twelve Men* (A98.3). *Resources for American Literary Study* 27.1 (2001): 139–42.

2001.5. Buell, Lawrence. "Consolations of Determinism: Dreiser and Jeffers." *Writing for an Endangered World: Literature, Culture, and Environment in the U.S. and Beyond*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2001. 149–56.

2001.6. Capo, Beth Widmaier. "Birth Control and the American Imagination: Textual Con(tra)ceptions, 1914–1944." Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State U, 2001. *DAI* 62.12 (2002): 4164A. Examines depictions of conception and the birth control movement in works of fiction and nonfiction by American writers, including Dreiser.

2001.7. Decker, Mark. "Flexible Commonplaces: The Novel, Social Thought, and the Reshaping of American Middle-Class Ideology, 1890–1940." Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State U, 2001. *DAI* 62.12 (2002): 4216A. " 'After All, You Didn't Make Yourself, Did You?' A New Middle-Class Morality in Theodore Dreiser's *Sister Carrie* and *An American Tragedy*" (thesis chapter).

2001.8. Devlin, Athena Beth. "Between Profits and Primitivism: Rehabilitating White Middle-Class Manhood in America, 1880–1917." Ph.D. dissertation, U of Massachusetts, 2001. *DAI* 62.9 (2002): 3087A. Uses primary sources in literature and the social sciences to locate and ana-

lyze changing discourses, images, and scientific representations of middle-class manhood and masculinity. Chapter 2, "The Male Body and the Market Economy: The Case of Dreiser's Frank Cowperwood," focuses on *The Financier* and *The Titan*.

2001.9. Epstein, Joseph. "*Sister Carrie* at 101." *Hudson Review* 54.1 (2001): 15–33.

2001.10. Gonda, Kenji. "The Dancer from the Dance: Law and Literature in Theodore Dreiser's *An American Tragedy*." *Studies in American Literature* (Kyoto, Japan) 38 (2001): 39–57.

2001.11. Gross, Andrew S. "Theodore Dreiser and Emily Post: Politics and Early Road Books." *Crossings: Travel, Art, Literature, Politics*." Ed. Rudolphus Teeuwen and Shu-li Chang. Taipei: Bookman, 2001. 105–20.

2001.12. Gross, Andrew Steven. "The Changing Shape of the American Landscape: Travel, Corporate Expansion, and Consumer Culture, 1845–1945." Ph.D. dissertation, U of California, Davis, 2001. *DAI* 62.9 (2002): 3046A. Chapter 3 focuses on the link between auto tourism and nationalism evidenced in road books by Emily Post, Dreiser, Henry James, and Edith Wharton.

2001.13. Haberski, Raymond J., Jr. "Dreiser Versus Hollywood." *It's Only a Movie! Films and Critics in American Culture*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2001. 63–80.

2001.14. Hammett, Dashiell. *Selected Letters of Dashiell Hammett 1921–1960*. Ed. Richard Layman and Julie M. Rivett. Washington, DC: Counterpoint, 2001. 156–60, 164, 176, 533–34. Contains Hammett letters and telegrams to Dreiser dated 13 November 1939, 15 January 1940, 19 September 1940, and March 1942, plus additional Dreiser-related content.

2001.15. Hapke, Laura. "Theodore Dreiser and the Counternarrative of Working Womanhood"; "To Die for: Labor and Belief in Upton Sinclair and Theodore Dreiser." *Labor's Text: The Worker in American Fiction*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2001. 155–57, 175–77 passim.

2001.16. Hochman, Barbara. "Getting at the Hidden Author in the Text." *Getting at the Author: Reimagining Books and Reading in the Age of American Realism*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2001. 3–18 passim. Examines Dreiser's *The Financier* in the context of an analysis of his authorial stance vis-à-vis the reader and of his narrative voice.

2001.17. Humphries, David T. "The Shock of Sympathy": Bob Ames's Reading and Re-reading of Sister Carrie. *Dreiser Studies* 32.1 (2001):

36–55.

2001.18. Hussman, Lawrence E. "On First Reading *Sister Carrie*." *Dreiser Studies* 32.2 (2001): 49–53.

2001.19. ———. Review of Signet Classics editions of *Sister Carrie* (A2000.1) and *An American Tragedy* (A2000.2). *Dreiser Studies* 32.1 (2001): 64–65.

2001.20. Jalon, Allan M. "Reading L.A.; High-Octane Dreiser." *Los Angeles Times* 29 Apr. 2001: E.2. Profile of Gengiz Babaev, a Los Angeles gas station attendant and Dreiser enthusiast who grew up reading Dreiser in Russian translation in his native Azerbaijan. Comments on reasons for Dreiser's popularity in Azerbaijan.

2001.21. Joshi, S. T., ed. *From Baltimore to Bohemia: The Letters of H. L. Mencken and George Sterling*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP; London: Associated UP, 2001. passim.

2001.22. Kolář, Stanislav. "The Czech Reception of *Sister Carrie*." *Dreiser Studies* 32.1 (2001): 56–63.

2001.23. Koloze, Jeff James. "Abortion in American Fiction: An Ethical Analysis of Select Works in Twentieth-Century American Literature." Ph.D. dissertation, Kent State U, 2001. *DAI* 63.1 (2002): 183A. Includes chapter on *An American Tragedy*.

2001.24. Lehan, Richard. *Literary Masterpieces, Volume 7: Sister Carrie*. Gale Study Guides to Great Literature. Farmington Hills, MI: Gale, 2001.

2001.25. Lo, Mun-Hou. "Sympathetic Disaffections: Self-Formation and Literature into the Turn of the Twentieth Century." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard U, 2001. *DAI* 62.4 (2001): 1413A. "Sympathy and Desire in Edith Wharton and Theodore Dreiser" (thesis chapter).

2001.26. Moughan, Michael. "American Literary Naturalism: The Evolution of the Term Naturalism, and an Identification of the Writers Who Were Most Responsible for How the Term Was Defined." Ph.D. dissertation, U of Delaware, 2001. *DAI* 62.5 (2001): 1835A. "1904 to 1915: From *Sea-Wolf* to *The 'Genius'* " (thesis chapter).

2001.27. Mutalik-Desai, A. A. "*Deus Ex Machina*: The Role of Coincidence and External Forces in Theodore Dreiser's *An American Tragedy*." *Indian Journal of English Studies* 39 (2001–2002): 130–36.

2001.28. Nathanson, Carol A. "Anne Estelle Rice and 'Ellen Adams Wrynn': Dreiser's Perspectives on Gender and Gendered Perspectives

on Art." *Dreiser Studies* 32.1 (2001): 3–35.

2001.29. Orlov, Paul A. "An Emersonian Perspective on Dreiser's Characterization of Carrie." *Dreiser Studies* 32.2 (2001): 19–37.

2001.30. Packer-Kinlaw, Donna. "Life on the Margins: The Silent Feminist in Theodore Dreiser's 'Marriage—For One.' " *Dreiser Studies* 32.2 (2001): 3–18.

2001.31. Pizer, Donald. "The Text of *Sister Carrie*: Where We Are Now." *Dreiser Studies* 32.2 (2001): 42–48.

2001.32. Rand, William E. "Chester Himes as a Naturalistic Writer in the Tradition of Richard Wright and Theodore Dreiser." *CLA Journal* 44.4 (2001): 442–50. Examines the use by African-American writers of naturalistic and deterministic techniques through a comparison of Dreiser's *An American Tragedy*, Richard Wright's *Native Son*, and Chester Himes's *If He Hollers Let Him Go*.

2001.33. Rossetti, Gina Marie. " 'A Living Lump of Appetites': The Reinvention of the Primitive in Naturalist and Modernist Literature." Ph.D. dissertation, U of Tennessee, 2001. *DAI* 63 (2002): 190A. Discusses the degree to which modernist and naturalist texts—including works by Jack London, Frank Norris, Eugene O'Neill, Dreiser, Gertrude Stein, and Nella Larsen—drew upon earlier romantic images and transformed them.

2001.34. Rowley, Hazel. *Richard Wright: The Life and Times*. New York: Henry Holt, 2001. 239.

2001.35. Russell, Herbert K. *Edgar Lee Masters: A Biography*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2001. passim.

2001.36. St. Jean, Shawn. " 'Aye, Chance, Free Will, and Necessity': *Sister Carrie*'s Literary Interweavings." *Midwest Quarterly* 42.3 (2001): 240–56.

2001.37. ———. *Pagan Dreiser: Songs from American Mythology*. Madison, NJ: Farleigh Dickinson UP, 2001.

2001.38. Sawyers, June Skinner, ed. *The Greenwich Village Reader: Fiction, Poetry, and Reminiscences, 1872–2002*. New York: Cooper Square, 2001. 702. Specifies addresses at which Dreiser lived in Greenwich Village.

2001.39. Seguin, Robert. "The Burden of Toil: *Sister Carrie* As Urban Pastoral." *Around Quitting Time: Work and Middle-Class Fantasy in American Fiction*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2001. 19–55.

2001.40. Shehi, Monika. "Theodore Dreiser: The Communist Individualist." Master's thesis, U of South Carolina, 2001.

2001.41. Tratner, Michael. "The Author as Consumer: *The Financier*." *Deficits and Desires: Economics and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Literature*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 2001. 46–71. Analyzes Dreiser's *The Financier* in the context of economic theory and pairs it with Joyce's *Ulysses* (the subject of an earlier chapter) as a means of understanding how the underlying economic logic plays out in the two works when viewed in a context of social and cultural change.

2001.42. Warren, Robert Penn. "Homage to Theodore Dreiser: Psychological Profile/On the Centennial of His Birth (August 27, 1871)." *Selected Poems of Robert Penn Warren*. Ed. John Burt. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 2001. 164–65. A revised and abridged version of poem with the same title that was originally published in Warren, *OR ELSE: Poem/Poems 1968–1974* (New York: Random, 1974).

2001.43. West, James L. W. III. "Editing Private Papers: Three Examples from Dreiser." *Re-constructing the Book: Literary Texts in Transmission*. Ed. Maureen Bell, et al. Aldershot, England and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001. 124–36. Uses as examples the Dreiser manuscripts that were published as *American Diaries, 1902–1926* (A82-1), *An Amateur Laborer* (A83-1), and *Dreiser's Russian Diary* (A96.2).

2001.44. ———. "The *Sister Carrie* We've Come to Know." *Dreiser Studies* 32.2 (2001): 39–41.

2001.45. Woods, Tim. "Dreiser, Theodore." *Who's Who of Twentieth-Century Novelists*. London; New York: Routledge, 2001. 102.

2001.46. *Writings of Theodore Dreiser* [videorecording]. West Lafayette, IN: C-SPAN Archives, 2001. Cable television program; videocassette (VHS; 2 hr. 31 min.). Contributors: Thomas P. Riggio, Sara Fenton, Peter Alter. Examines the history of the Progressive Era, the publishing industry, and social reform through the writings of Dreiser. Filmed Aug. 20, 2001 at the Chicago Historical Society.

2001.47. Wydeven, J. J. Review of Theodore Dreiser, *Art, Music, and Literature, 1897–1902* (D2001.2). *Choice* 39.4 (2001): 682.

Reviews

The Cambridge Companion to Theodore Dreiser, ed. Leonard Cassuto and Clare Virginia Eby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xx + 234 pp. Cloth, $65.00. Paper, $23.00.

Cambridge Companions to Literature are the little black frocks of the academic world. These affordable and essential components of a well-stocked shelf are dependable, up-to-date without being trendy, and useful to students of literature at any point in their careers and for nearly every occasion. The apparatus for these volumes—generally an intelligent introduction, copious chronology and judiciously selected bibliography, in addition to the notes and recommended readings accompanying each essay—can't help but bring the novice up to speed on the writer or literary movement in question—as well as introduce the major players in the field. At the same time an old hand will always find something worth the reading, as new directions in literary theory turn provocative new lights on the subject.

The Cambridge Companion to Theodore Dreiser is no exception. The twelve essays assembled here take a largely cultural studies approach which results in a satisfyingly complex treatment of the man and his work. Two of the four essays that make up "Part I: Backgrounds and Contexts" situate Dreiser firmly and provocatively in his time—a time when individual identity became more and more the product of market forces, and writing joined medicine and the law in the sphere of professions, no longer socially denigrated because done for money. Another essay in this section convincingly situates Dreiser's "mixture of biography, autobiography and wild imaginings" in historical relation to experiments in the biographical form by near contemporaries Henry Adams, Gertrude Stein and Edward Bok and later experimental work by such writers as Richard Wright, Truman Capote and Norman Mailer. A fourth essay, on Dreiser's style, has the distinction of being the only essay in the collection to address Dreiser's rhetorical practice directly, using close analysis of key passages to argue that the formal peculiarities of Dreiser's prose are essentially performative: they arise from and

© 2004 Dreiser Studies

enact on a syntactic level the cultural and ideological dialogues the novels dramatize. The argument is very convincing, and the close readings are marred only by the author's assumption, in reference to a description of Mrs. Hurstwood in *Sister Carrie*, that a "pythoness" is a kind of lady snake, rather than a Delphic priestess, which goof ought to be flagged for correction when the *Cambridge Companion* goes into a second edition.

The eight essays making up "Part II: Dreiser and His Culture" amplify and particularize the issues raised in Part I. The editors make the wise choice in this section of limiting essays dealing with single works, favoring instead chewy topics approaches—e.g., Dreiser and modernity, and art, and crime—that range widely and intelligently across the works and their cultural milieu. Not surprisingly, *Sister Carrie, An American Tragedy,* and the Cowperwood novels get the bulk of attention, but none of his work goes entirely unaddressed. Race, class, and gender are the ruling triumvirate of cultural studies, and four essays explicitly fly their banners. Dreiser's multivalent and career-long scrutiny of class in America as an economic, regional, gendered and, above all, emergent phenomenon merits two excellent essays: one on upward mobility in *The Financier*, and a second proposing "home" and "homelessness" as sites for the enactment of middle-class anxiety throughout Dreiser's works. Gender issues and the uneasy relations between feminists and Dreiser's writings are specifically surveyed in one closely focused essay, but Dreiser's women and men, their relations of power in and through sexuality, and their fates as gendered subjects are, appropriately, at the center of most of the essays in this part of the *Companion*; so gender, like class, gets a full and theoretically up-to-date discussion.

Of the three, race gets the least satisfying treatment, though the essay specifically dealing with race begins promisingly with a suggestive reading of the racial geography of the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition, which Dreiser visited in his capacity as reporter for the *St. Louis Republic.* Implicit in this portion of the essay is that race in America at this time was, like class, an emergent phenomenon. While the organizers of the fair's Midway Plaisance may have been busily, if unconsciously, ranking world cultures in a progression running from dark-skinned, benighted, and barbaric up to light-skinned, civilized, and progressive, it is clear that "white" at the Exposition was synonymous with "American" native status rather than with any accident of racial phenotype. (In Wister's nearly contemporary novel *The Virginian*, for example, this fluidity of racial categories is illustrated in Scipio LeMoyne, a cowpoke of French ancestry genially treated by all as a "colored" person.) At the Midway Plaisance blackness was romantically African: "Nubians, Cingalese, Soudanese, Moors." The absence of black

Americans from the Exposition's Midway Plaisance and White City is telling. This is good stuff; one needs to be reminded from time to time that, a hundred years ago, racial categories were different, and racism acted through the categories of its day, not ours. The second half of the essay, unfortunately, falls into the trap of reading Dreiser's depiction of Hurstwood's fall in class through fixed ideas of blackness and whiteness which the first half of the essay has demonstrated to be simplified and anachronistic. It's a peculiar choice and seems arbitrarily fixed upon for the sake of the essay. Still, as an attempt to pick through and make visible unstated assumptions about race driving one of the most socially alert writers of his day it's an important first step into the last uncharted regions of Dreiser studies, where there is still much work to be done.

Minor complaints aside, the whole volume is a pleasure to read. The authors of the essays are clearly committed to advancing critical understanding of Dreiser and his works. While their approaches are clothed in several contemporary theories of literature, keeping their several audiences in mind they wear their theory lightly. The editors have judiciously selected the essays for variety, coverage, and enjoyment and arranged them coherently. Readers will find ideas to talk about, arguments to embrace or resist and, above all, a strengthened vision of Dreiser in his times.

—Carol S. Loranger, Wright State University

An Honest Writer: The Life and Times of James T. Farrell, by Robert K. Landers. San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2004. xv + 562 pp. Cloth, $28.95.

This first full-scale biography of Farrell includes an introduction, three parts comprising nineteen chapters, twenty-one photographs, and 110 pages of endnotes. Drawing on an array of archival materials, as well as numerous interviews with Farrell's surviving relatives, friends, and acquaintances, Robert K. Landers has assembled much information otherwise unpublished or scattered in various publications. The events and work of Farrell's last years are here for the first time given attention in print. We must be grateful for the appearance of this book in Farrell's centenary year, since it prompts further reading and discussion of the most undervalued of all major writers of American fiction. Regrettably, Landers's book repeats many received opinions about Farrell's fiction and does not fully recognize the importance of its achievement. Much less does Landers anywhere express the wonder that should come naturally to a biographer considering Farrell's incredible

story.

In a prologue to "Part One: Young Farrell," for example, Landers stresses what he calls "the most significant event" of Farrell's life: his separation from his parents at the age of two, to be raised thereafter in the home of his maternal grandmother. Landers argues that this separation caused "a psychic wound" that was somehow to become a cause of Farrell's "creative strength." The separation, according to Landers, "gave rise to questions that would haunt him and haunt his fiction: *Why had his parents given him away? Was there something wrong with him? Or with them?*" But the questions Landers asks here are not questions raised by Farrell. They never did haunt him or his writings, and for this reason they are scarcely again mentioned by Landers after the prologue of the book.

Instead, a laconic footnote refers the reader to Edmund Wilson's *The Wound and the Bow*, as if merely citing Wilson's criticism of Sophocles' *Philoctetes* could somehow explain Farrell and his fiction. The intent of the analogy goes unexplained by Landers: unlike the crippled Philoctetes, the child Farrell had not committed sacrilege or been incurably snakebitten. Confusingly, Landers states that Farrell's "wound" was "a self-inflicted injury, by a child who didn't understand what was happening." But Farrell and his relatives retold the story of his defection from the parental household many times. Always the point of the story, as Farrell told it with retrospective delight, is that a two-year-old imposed his own will on his family. At no time in his life, as far as I have been able to find, did Farrell ever regret or hold his parents responsible for giving him away, nor question his own prudence or wisdom in this matter, which remained for him a remarkable confirmation of his own formidably sound judgment, even at so tender an age.

Farrell's "wound" is something of an obsession for Landers, who quotes an amazing diary note Farrell wrote, reflecting on conversation about his high school classmates at a 1938 dinner he hosted for one of them, the archeologist Richard Parker: "I was the only rebel from the class. I rebelled against everything of any importance in the total environment of those days. They did not. They are nostalgic where I am bitter and critical and objective." Landers's comment on this diary note, in keeping with his approach to Farrell's entire life and work, is that Farrell's classmates "had let all the slights and hurts of adolescence fade from memory, but Farrell had not. For him, the wounds were still fresh." But the important point we should note about Farrell's diary note is not that his classmates had "let go" of the adolescent pain caused them by their culture of origin but that, unlike himself, none of them had ever shared his precocious objections to that culture, not

even the brilliant Parker who was to become a highly educated scientist. Landers fails really to notice the wonderful, central problem of Farrell's background and early life.

Similarly, this book frequently labels Farrell's fiction "adolescent," a fundamental if not original mistake of many critics Landers quotes approvingly. What strikes one about Farrell's fiction is its resistance to sentimentality and nostalgia, its forthright presentation of real human experience, no matter the personal cost. But Landers tends to limit Farrell's distinction as a writer to mere "adolescent angst" and near-total recall.

So completely to have distorted the uniqueness of Farrell's emergence from the Chicago South Side Irish American community is a bad start, but *An Honest Writer* succeeds better in "Part Two: Novelist and Radical." Here the word "honest" in the title of the book expresses what Landers amply documents: Farrell's "integrity and courage" as a leftist writer faced with both organized and personal pressure to conform to the Communist Party line, not solely over issues such as the Moscow show trials, or political terror and slave labor in the USSR, but in a more general sense as an artist.

Significant is the story Landers tells of Farrell's conversation with Whittaker Chambers at the Manhattan office of *New Masses* in the spring of 1932. At this early date Chambers was a CP true believer serving as editor of the party's literary magazine. He told Farrell that revolutionary writers should use "art as a weapon" in the class struggle. Farrell disagreed, maintaining that literary art, although it may well embody social criticism, is essentially an aesthetic effort to wrest meaning from individual experience, not an instrument of policy. Farrell, with philosophical sophistication rooted in his study of Dewey and Mead, never altered this independent view, although he remained for some years convinced that the evils of capitalism would lead to political revolution in America. Landers misinterprets this conviction as evidence that Farrell was "steadfast in his revolutionary faith," and he mistakenly groups Farrell with "other fervent believers."

To conclude: this book is conventionally conceived and contains false threads that connect it to decades of neglect or vituperation never deserved by Farrell. The title is ironical, one feels, since almost every chapter of the book tries to convict Farrell of some political or literary self-deception. He deserves a better biography.

—Dennis Flynn, Bentley College

H. L. Mencken on American Literature, ed. S. T. Joshi. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2002. xx + 284 pp. Cloth, $44.95.
Mencken's America, ed. S. T. Joshi. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2004. xx + 244 pp. Cloth, $49.95. Paper, $22.95.

These are books that we in the American studies business have long needed, and we should be grateful to S. T. Joshi for doing such a fine job of assembling them. H. L. Mencken was one of the greatest cultural commentators the United States ever produced. The "sense of superiority" which Mencken stated as a requirement for his own happiness—and his evident need to demonstrate it at every turn—made him a born critic. In fact, Mencken was critical of just about everything about our "amateurish and childish" culture ("a commonwealth of third-rate men," he called it), and he showed himself willing to expound upon almost any topic. So it's a great help to have his diverse and voluminous opinions about America and its literature and writers culled and distilled into two handsome companion volumes.

Mencken broke into journalism in 1906 and continued in the trade until a 1948 stroke left him unable to read and write. He wrote widely and eclectically, and today he is celebrated as an editorial commentator, journalist, and philologist as well as a literary critic. Largely because of his phenomenal productivity, Mencken remains a prize yet unbagged by bibliographers. There is no standard edition or comprehensive collection, nor is one yet visible on the horizon.

Mencken's America is an example of the kind of fine editorial work that may be done with his enormous output of uncollected occasional prose. The thematic through-line of Joshi's volume is what Mencken calls "Puritanism," his name for the sort of benighted cultural conservatism he deplored in the United States. Lucidly anatomized by Joshi in his introduction, Mencken's Puritanism has historical continuities with but wasn't directly connected to the New England colonial version. Rather, the severe New England Puritan serves as a point of departure from which Mencken winds his way—via some entertaining, albeit tendentious, historical theorizing—to a "New Puritan" who operates on a much larger scale than in times of old. Mencken's New Puritan aims his moral artillery at any and all forms of pleasure both high and low, from drinking (temperance leagues were a favorite Mencken target) to literary censorship.

The movement in Mencken's time to suppress "indecent" literature provides the link between Joshi's two volumes. Led by postal bureaucrat and high-minded moral crusader Anthony Comstock, the forces of censorship

exerted considerable power in the United States during the first quarter of the twentieth century, and Mencken was among the most prominent of those who opposed them. "In Comstockery," wrote Mencken, "the new Puritanism took its formal departure from the old, and moral endeavor suffered a general overhauling and tightening of screws." Among those tortured was Theodore Dreiser, whose 1915 novel, *The "Genius,"* was banned by The New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, one of the many offices of the Comstock bureaucracy. Though Mencken thought the novel to be a weak effort of Dreiser's, he nevertheless fought hard for its distribution, organizing a petition drive and enlisting the support of many leading artists of the day.

But Mencken's support for unfettered literary creativity was not limited to acts of public protest. Working as a literary critic, Mencken sought to identify the best and most vital American literature of his time. Most of his literary criticism, notes Joshi in his useful introduction to *H. L. Mencken on American Literature*, was written between 1908 and 1933 for *The Smart Set* and *The American Mercury*, and this collection—centered on his assessments of prose fiction—represents a judicious selection from the thousands of pages of reviews and criticism which the prolific Mencken published in his main outlets and elsewhere.

Mencken's opinions are predictably untempered by politeness or any other niceties, and they are as bracing now as they were when he wrote them. "My literary theory," wrote Mencken, "is based chiefly upon one main idea, to wit, the idea of freedom." In literary terms, this means "the simple right to utter what seems (at the moment) to be the truth." As a reviewer, Mencken devoted himself not only to searching for this truth, but—and sometimes, it seems, principally—to hunting down and attacking work which, in his judgment, fell short of it.

Mencken accordingly spent a lot of time deploring the low quality of the literary work of America's "corn-fed geniuses." He ladled acid on the sentimental wherever he saw it ("a string of gum-drops. A sugar-teat beyond compare"), but he likewise deplored didacticism, and especially pandering to low, mass-market tastes.

But he wasn't all tabasco sauce and wrecking balls. What Mencken liked, he believed in. And what he believed in, he fought hard for, and he persuaded many others to share his views. As a result, we can trace the lofty canonical position of some notable American authors to Mencken's tireless drumbeat of support for them. The unspoken aim of Mencken the critic, notes Joshi, was no less than to shape the national literary canon, and this volume reproduces his effort to do so. Joshi has therefore resisted the temp-

tation to fill the volume with Mencken's vitriolic skewerings of now-anonymous lesser writers, offering only a representative sample of our most sadistic critic delightedly doling out punishment. Much of the collection is instead focused on Mencken's favorite authors—most of whom are our favorites too.

Dreiser was perhaps the prime beneficiary of Mencken's starmaking ambitions. Mencken boosted Dreiser relentlessly, and his efforts helped to push Dreiser into the first rank of American novelists in his own time, and to secure his position there. (Some others on behalf of whom Mencken toiled especially long include Fitzgerald, Cather, and Lewis, to name a few.) Dreiser, Mencken wrote, "is the one novelist among us who shows no response whatever to the variable winds of public favor; he hacks out his path undeterred by either praise or blame; a sort of blind fury of creation seems to move him."

Mencken singled out Dreiser for the highest praise. He famously—at least in Dreiser circles—compared *Jennie Gerhardt* to *Huckleberry Finn.* But when Dreiser fell short of Mencken's expectations, the critic refused to spare his favored writer. Included in this volume are Mencken's reviews of all of Dreiser's novels from the 'teens and twenties (plus an approving account of *A Hoosier Holiday*), including the well-known put-down of *The "Genius"* and a surprisingly mixed appreciation of *An American Tragedy.*

One might wonder whether historical distance might cause us to question Mencken's acumen. Rarely so. In many cases, in fact, *H. L. Mencken on American Literature* shows that it was often Mencken's early judgment which forms the basis for our continuing appreciation of an author. More generally, Mencken's attacks on national self-absorption in *Mencken's America* have an eerie prescience and disturbing relevance in today's age of terrorism. Joshi's excellent collections give an idea of the panoramic knowledge and deep commitment which informed Mencken's wide-ranging judgments about his literary and cultural surroundings. These volumes are an achievement, a delight, and—how rare for academic books!—great gift ideas too.

—Leonard Cassuto, Fordham University

The Jungle, by Upton Sinclair. Ed. Clare Virginia Eby. Norton Critical Edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003. 526 pp. Paper, $12.10.

With the efficient dexterity that we have come to expect of her, Clare Eby presents her edition of Upton Sinclair's classic novel of the muckraking era, *The Jungle*, first published in 1906. The novel demonstrates, among other things, the sometimes-shared membership in muckraking by Sinclair and Dreiser. Sinclair, as we know, leaped in with both feet, for a long career, while Dreiser might be said to have only dragged a toe through the muck, being considerably more focused on his characters and on the large social themes of his novels.

Even so, Dreiser's *Financier*, published only half a dozen years after *The Jungle*, rather closely approximates the work of Sinclair who, faced with similar materials, would have told the story from the point of view of one of Frank Cowperwood's unthanked streetcar operators.

For Sinclair, the detailed expose of the immense scandals prominent in Chicago's Packingtown is central, and he pushes relentlessly the ideological/political strands of his story, most especially Socialism. Has there been any aspect of political life that has been more maligned and distorted by time and its enemies than the widely-admired Socialism of the early twentieth century? Every sort of reputable thinker was inclined then in its direction, including clergy. It is known that Edward Cummings, the famous preacher-father of the poet, steered his son toward Socialism (along with other Harvard students such as John Dos Passos) within a decade of publication of *The Jungle*. Idealism was the reason; then Socialism during World War I became entangled with Marxist Communism, and thereafter, in too many quarters, its name was mud: guilt by association. Even now it serves as a potent cudgel in the political wars.

Sister Carrie might conceivably pair with *The Jungle* so far as Carrie's early days in Chicago are concerned. And her brother-in-law, Hansen, works in Packingtown in the refrigerated railroad car "division." Friends of Dreiser will take an interest in Dreiser's interview with meatpacker Philip D. Armour, included in the present volume but originally appearing in Orson Swett Marden's magazine *Success* in 1898. It would be a leap to infer that the interview is a piece of muckraking prose, for Dreiser wrote it as a unit in his praising series "Life Stories of Successful Men," and it follows the general pattern (desired, perhaps dictated, by Marden) aimed at unveiling the secrets of Armour's great success as a businessman, not in any sense being a revelation of the shameful, shocking practices of Packingtown.

Armour, labeled "the great Hercules of American industry," is asked questions that Dreiser used routinely in his series: What was the meaning of success? Was it possible still for a newcomer to become as rich and powerful as Armour had? What qualities in the subject's parents and in his upbringing most contributed to his success? And what conditions first spurred Armour's achievement?

Armour also was asked a question in which Dreiser had a particular interest: to what degree did Armour win out because of good fortune—plain luck? His answer was predictable. It was the same answer given by the merchant-king Marshall Field and others among the "greats" of Chicago: Luck had nothing to do with it. A man's achievement—this man's, anyway—was due solely to effort, including imaginative ideas, focus, and hard, hard, unceasing work.

Students have ever reacted well to *The Jungle*, soaking up the events as if taken from contemporary research. Ongoing revelations and scandals in industry (read: Enron?) convince Sinclair's readers that he tells the truth: if this could happen—and it did—then it could happen again. I well recall an hour regularly spent with Sinclair in an American literature lecture fifty years ago. I had only my original edition of *The Jungle* to rely on as a source, but I made my point by reading directly from the text a number of the "juicier" scenes, the most effective being perhaps the anecdote of the workingman who had the bad grace to fall into a cauldron and go out to the world as pure leaf lard.

The Jungle, as presently edited, includes a number of relevant and associated pieces, all judiciously selected. The student is given contemporary reviews (a piece by Jack London that makes "utopian" claims for the influence he expects from *The Jungle*), intriguing analyses of the Chicago population, a helpful map of the Union Stockyards (scene of the novel), and well-selected pieces by social analysts between 1900 and the present—in short, what one expects from any volume in this respected series.

—Philip Gerber, SUNY Brockport

The Vast and Terrible Drama: American Literary Naturalism in the Late Nineteenth Century, by Eric Carl Link. Studies in American Literary Realism and Naturalism. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2004. 231 pp. Cloth, $35.00.

"For most people, Naturalism has a vague meaning," Frank Norris wrote in 1896 in his essay "Zola as a Romantic Writer." "It is a sort of inner circle of realism—a kind of diametric opposite of romanticism, a theory of fiction wherein things are represented 'as they really are,' inexorably, with the truthfulness of a camera. This idea can be shown to be far from right, that Naturalism, as understood by Zola, is but a form of romanticism after all."

In his groundbreaking study *The Vast and Terrible Drama: American Literary Naturalism in the Late Nineteenth Century*—the compelling title is a quotation from the aforementioned Norris essay—Eric Carl Link has examined and attempted to disentangle the competing literary credos, theories, manifestos, and critical opinions that were in the air when the naturalist ethos took root in American literature at the end of nineteenth century and which have continued to be discussed and argued about by scholars ever since. His monograph is a splendid exercise in literary taxonomy. It is also a work which, like Louis Menand's recent book, *The Metaphysical Club*, adeptly frames the debate within the context of its times as experienced by individual writers, and, in so doing, provides a synthesis that in essence comprises a history of ideas as well as a work of literary history and criticism.

It is Norris's observations (as well as his fiction) that Link uses as a jumping off point for his own investigation of American literary naturalism. His main concern is with "definitional, descriptive, contextual, and theoretical matters," with an examination of American literary naturalism as a totality, rather than individual authors per se (although he does provide extended analyses of individual works such as Stephen Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage* and Norris's *Vandover and the Brute*). He takes issue with representative definitions of naturalism advanced by an earlier generation of scholars such as Lars Åhnebrink and George Becker, which emphasize literary naturalism's deterministic philosophical orientation and realistic aesthetic creed. What the works of the naturalists have in common, Link argues, is not a deterministic credo or a pessimistic outlook but their thematic content. "It is *theme*, rather than genre, methodology, convention, tone, or philosophy, that qualifies a text for admission in the 'school' of American *literary* naturalism," he concludes. Rather than consciously attempting, in a Zolaesque spirit, to transfer either philosophical or scientific naturalism into

literary form, the American literary naturalists "can be better understood as exploring themes arising out of the academic milieu of the day," a period when the ideas of Charles Darwin, Herbert Spencer, John Fiske, William Graham Sumner, Thomas Huxley, Charles Lyell, and Arthur Schopenhauer were prominent on the intellectual horizon.

Naturalist theory, Link asserts—using his expansive, revisionist definition of the genre—can enter a narrative through symbolism (as in the aquarium passage that acts as a thematic icon in Dreiser's Cowperwood trilogy) or, alternatively, through characters who express or represent elements of naturalistic theory (as can be seen in characters such as Norris's McTeague or Wolf Larsen in Jack London's *The Sea-Wolf*). Naturalist theory can also form the basis of the plot, as in Norris's *McTeague* and *Vandover and the Brute*. Link makes a distinction between "light" or "positive" and "dark" or "negative" forms of naturalism, either of which strains can be predominant depending upon the author and the work. Dreiser's *Sister Carrie* and *Newspaper Days* can be characterized as examples of negative literary naturalism, with their essentially pessimistic outlook, while *Jennie Gerhardt* exhibits a blending within the narrative of positive and negative tendencies.

The American literary naturalists (notably Dreiser), Link points out, were for the most part unaware of and not affected by the theories adumbrated by Émile Zola in his literary manifesto *Le roman expérimental*, which called for the application of scientific positivism to literature. Rather than writing within the tradition and strict confines of the realistic novel, Link concludes, Rebecca Harding Davis, Oliver Wendell Holmes (whose little-known novel *Elsie Venner* is discussed as an important forerunner of literary naturalism), Norris, Crane, and Harold Frederic drew heavily on romantic forms and conventions. Link makes the novel (it is, he acknowledges, not completely new) claim that literary naturalism is more closely allied to the romanticism of antebellum writers such as Charles Brockden Brown, Poe, Hawthorne, and Melville than it is to the realism of writers like Howells and Garland. The naturalistic novel, he argues, should not be considered as a subset—a sort of offspring or offshoot (and a failed one at that due to a failure of design or literary execution)—of the realistic novel.

A valuable contribution of this monograph is to place American literary naturalism within the context of the cultural/intellectual/historical currents within which it operated. Among the questions Link addresses are the relationship of the American "school" of literary naturalism and the French school (he argues that the theoretical writings of Zola had limited practical impact on the development of American literary naturalism); the crucial distinction among philosophic, scientific, and literary naturalism; and why

American literary naturalism seems to have encompassed more diverse forms and treatments than its European counterparts, which were more uniformly positivistic. "[O]ur understanding of American literary naturalism," he concludes, "benefits most when we look at the evolution of this literary movement, not solely within the context of literary realism, but within the context of the whole nineteenth century—socially, philosophically, culturally, and aesthetically." He commends the efforts of scholars who in recent years have made efforts in this direction, notably Donna Campbell, June Howard, Jennifer Fleissner, and Donald Pizer. A particularly important thrust of this new research, he suggests (and exemplifies in this study), is to look both backwards and forwards in time. Literary naturalism did not spring forth full grown in the 1890s but had its roots in mid-nineteenth century works, he concludes, noting that works such as Holmes's *Elsie Venner* and Davis's *Life in the Iron Mills* provide a "clear bridge" between the first and second halves of the nineteenth century.

Many critics have commented on what they perceive as an evolution in Dreiser's outlook, from the deterministic ethos of *Sister Carrie*, where the theories of Herbert Spencer are invoked, to his final work, *The Bulwark*, which has been seen as representing a break on Dreiser's part with naturalism. Link does not discuss the posthumously published *Bulwark*, but he does discuss Dreiser's earlier novels, particularly *The Financier*. He finds a uniquely Dreiserian strain of "dark romanticism . . . which manifests itself in Dreiser's symbolically charged naturalistic novels." In works such as *Sister Carrie* and *The Financier*, Link observes, Dreiser implements a romantic symbolism "that seeks to embody and reveal the abstract, hidden forces in nature" in a way more reminiscent of romantic works from the early to mid-nineteenth century than realism: "In several of his major novels, Dreiser abandons the intratextual realist symbol for the larger romantic symbol, with its universal and/or metaphysical implications." An example is provided by the lobster and squid episode in the *Financier*. "The symbolic struggle between lobster and squid," Link observes, "does more than simply represent Cowperwood's struggle for survival in the world of finance; it symbolizes the struggle for survival engaged in throughout nature. . . ." Dreiser's later writings, Link suggests, seem to indicate that his views were evolving in the direction of a "softer" form of determinism.

This is a lucid, elegantly written, deeply learned, and important new contribution to our understanding of literary naturalism.

—Roger W. Smith

American Literary Realism, Critical Theory, and Intellectual Prestige, 1880–1995, by Phillip Barrish. Cambridge Studies in American Literature and Culture 126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 213 pp. Cloth, $60.00.

I did not expect to like this book. After all, two colleagues had declined to review it because of its jargon-filled introduction. Though it announces his purpose well enough, Barrish's opening sentence is hardly a grabber: "This book explores how certain key works of American literary realism articulate within themselves new ways of gaining intellectual prestige or distinction—new ways of gaining, that is, some degree of cultural recognition as unusually intelligent, discerning, sensitive, alert, knowledgeable, or even wise." Things get worse as Barrish engages in tiresome poststructuralist word-play about the "realist disposition" he intends to reveal. The word *disposition*, he declares, not only "moves towards the large semantic category of taste" but in its prefix *dis-* "helps point to the prominence of paradoxical embraces of negativity" that anticipate "poststructuralism's emphasis on absence and aporia." As for *position*, it "signifies that to talk about prestige is to talk about . . . textual positions (or, rather, *dis*positions) [that] accrue intellectual status and prestige for themselves through asserting an exclusively proximate relationship with, yet also a signifying distance from, life's most nitty-gritty dimensions." The book's theoretical base is Pierre Bourdieu's 1984 *Distinction: A Social Critique of Judgments of Taste*. I am not familiar with Bourdieu's notion of distinction, but in Barrish's account it sounds a lot like Veblen's conspicuous display: "Distinction in modern Western culture functions above all to show (or show off) one's 'objective distance' from needing to worry about 'the demands of biological nature,' such as, for example, the body's requirements concerning nourishment and shelter." Barrish offers, however, to leaven Bourdieu's sometimes-reductive sociological theory with a "postructuralist sensitivity" to the construction of reality in language. The result, I was surprised to find, is an interesting and persuasive piece of practical criticism. It not only helps explain why we like and admire some characters in realist works more than others but also shows how certain critics since mid-century have employed similar strategies to gain prestige for their own critical positions.

Like a number of recent critics, Barrish argues that realism, far from being a democratic movement, is elitist at its core. Howells is Barrish's test case. In his criticism, Howells "follows the Arnoldian imperative" to distinguish between "truly *fine* art" and other productions and assigns cultural status to "those readers astute enough to recognize the 'fine-art' potential of

commonplace, even coarse, material." In *The Rise of Silas Lapham*, Howells attributes such "realist taste" to Tom Corey and Penelope Lapham, who distinguish themselves from their families by their attitude towards Silas's vernacular speech. While Silas and Irene Lapham are largely unaware of his speech as a mode of expression and while Bromfield Corey, like other less astute members of the middle and upper classes, sees it as merely "exotically picturesque," Tom and Penelope not only recognize the distinctiveness of Silas's uncultivated language but develop "an aesthetic liking" for it that is fully congruent with their appreciation of high culture. Mediating between the "raw American real" and the "culturally overcooked," they are the novel's center of value.

Barrish goes on to discuss how realist taste accrues distinction in Howells's later novels, especially *A Hazard of New Fortunes*, and in Henry James's *The Wings of the Dove*, Abraham Cahan's *The Rise of David Levinsky*, and Edith Wharton's *Twilight Sleep*. In each novel, he identifies a different conception of what signifies the "real" and explains how characters' response to this real earns them distinction. For instance, in *A Hazard of New Fortunes*, the "bottom-line 'real' " is the world's "contingency," the fact that linguistic practices and social structures are not absolutes but products of "multiple factors of history and chance." What sets Basil March apart from other characters is his bemused irony, his ability to recognize the fortuitousness of his own privileged position even while living as if the suffering of the poor were part of the nature of things. Compared to his wife and other characters in the novel, he adopts a "realer-than-thou" stance; he accepts "a second, even more difficult, reality," the fact that contingency does not make "conditions themselves any less there, any less certain, any less stable." Feeling others' pain, recognizing the "structural impediments" to significant social change, and viewing his own impotent liberalism with irony, Basil reveals a "complex realist masculinity" that anticipates "the only seemingly simpler modernist virility of Hemingway's Jake Barnes or Nick Adams." A similar opposition between a simple and a more sophisticated level of reality, Barrish argues in succeeding chapters, structures our response to the protagonists of James, Cahan, and Wharton.

After a series of subtle and largely persuasive readings of realist fiction, Barrish jumps ahead in time to consider "the dynamics of distinction on the recent critical scene," as the subtitle to his fifth chapter puts it. In five critics—Lionel Trilling, John Guillory, Paul de Man, Joan Copjec, and Judith Butler—he finds the same kind of "realer-than-thou" attitude he has exposed in the realists and their characters. Each of these critics in one way or another professes to be "getting in touch with nitty-gritty materiality" as a

way "subtly to elevate one group of literary intellectuals over another." Of special interest to Dreiserians is Barrish's analysis of Trilling's "Reality in America," which privileges James's notion of reality over Dreiser's and attempts to elevate Trilling's own critical position over that of Vernon Parrington and his followers. Agreeing that "critical status" does indeed come from "an approach's intimacy with material reality," Trilling finds in the Parrington school a crude understanding of this reality, a blindness to what he, in his more sophisticated understanding, recognizes as "the primacy of complication—of ambiguity, variousness, difficulty," all of which constitute "the very nature of America's everyday actuality." Like Howells before him, Trilling suggests that to be in touch with this more complicated, more real, real is to demonstrate one's superior "taste."

The unstated object lesson for Dreiserians in Barrish's book is that the disdain still often found in critical discussions of Dreiser is largely undeserved. Any notion of reality offered as a truer version than another, Barrish implies, will ultimately lose out in the intellectual struggle for place. Dreiser himself would probably be amused by intellectual battles that, while never arriving at absolute truth, at least make life an interesting spectacle. "*Life is a game*," he wrote in *Notes on Life*. And without "spirit or vanity on the part of each, no game would be worth seeing."

—Stephen C. Brennan, Louisiana State University in Shreveport

Schwester Carrie, by Theodore Dreiser. Trans. Anna Nussbaum. Introd. Heike Paul. Leipzig-Weissenfels: Verlag Ille & Riemer GbR, 2004. 351 pp. Paper, EUR 15.

For the last two decades German translations of Dreiser's works have been out of print. *Schwester Carrie* had last been published in 1980 in the German Democratic Republic and later was only available in second-hand bookstores. The new edition by the young Leipzig-based firm of Ille & Riemer (founded in 2002) may therefore signal a turning point. It attracted the immediate attention of a leading German newspaper, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, which, on 18 August 2004, devoted a two-column review to the book headlined "A successful frown: Theodore Dreiser's *Schwester Carrie* to be rediscovered—almost" (trans.). It was illustrated with a typical Dreiser caricature that helped to catch the reader's attention. The reviewer, Ingeborg Harms, praised the publishing house for its decision to begin its series of world classics with *Schwester Carrie* and offered a spirited discus-

sion of Dreiser's novel that can hold its own against Heike Paul's introduction provided in the new edition itself. Harms critiques the translation, which she assumes has not been revised since the 1929 translation originally published by Zsolnay in Vienna, Berlin, and Leipzig. In fact, however, the 2004 edition shows some silent improvements, as do other postwar editions, but some of these, such as the version published in 1953 by Aufbau Verlag (Berlin), have been more successful revisions. Since Anna Nussbaum's translation received some heavy criticism when it first appeared in 1929, a complete new translation instead of a mere revision would have been a better option.

Following the text of *Schwester Carrie*, an introduction to the author and his work is provided by Heike Paul, who teaches at the University of Leipzig. The essay, which is supported by a number of fine quotations from Moers, Pizer, Riggio, and others, conveys a good sense of the novel's importance and Dreiser's difficult position as a naturalist modern writer in turn-of-the-20th-century urban America. Paul recounts the myth of the novel's suppression and then focuses on Dreiser's outsider position as a German-American before proceeding to renew the old criticisms of Dreiser's style. His "stylistic flaws," she oddly explains, "have been smoothed in the translation." While readers may gather a sense of the general direction of the novel's reception, they cannot always trust the facts presented here (e.g. Dreiser is referred to as the eleventh child in his family born on 17 August 1871, his studies are financed by a male teacher, "Lehrer," and *The "Genius"* is cited as the third volume of the Cowperwood trilogy). There is also no mention of the 1981 Pennsylvania Dreiser Edition of *Sister Carrie*. A short, somewhat arbitrary selection of secondary sources from 1955 to 1997 concludes the volume, which may guide the interested reader to more extensive information.

—Renate von Bardeleben, Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz

News & Notes

Mark and Maggie Walker have contracted with Hamilton Books, an imprint of University Press of America, to publish the first full-scale biography of Arthur Henry, Dreiser's friend and sometime collaborator in the late 1890s who urged him to write *Sister Carrie*. Maggie Walker is Henry's granddaughter. The couple, now in their 80s, have been at work on the book for several years and it represents the fulfillment of a dream for both of them. The title is *Dreiser's 'Other Self': The Life of Arthur Henry* and is scheduled for publication in March 2005. For further information contact markwalker@astound.net.

Two new volumes in the Dreiser Edition will be published fall 2004: *A Traveler at Forty*, edited by Renate von Bardeleben, includes for the first time the full text of the book; *Interviews*, edited by Frederic E. Rusch and Donald Pizer, is the first collection of seventy key interviews, selected from among 200. Both are published by the University of Illinois Press under the general editorship of Thomas P. Riggio.

Contributors

Renate von Bardeleben, a professor of American literature at the University of Mainz in Germany, is the author or editor of nine books. Her new complete edition of Dreiser's *A Traveler at Forty* will be published by the University of Illinois Press in the fall of 2004.

Stephen C. Brennan teaches English at Louisiana State University in Shreveport. The co-editor of *Dreiser Studies*, he has published a number of articles on Dreiser and is working on a documentary volume on Dreiser for the Dictionary of Literary Biography.

Leonard Cassuto is Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in the English Department at Fordham University. He is working on a study of twentieth-century crime fiction.

Dennis Flynn is Professor of English at Bentley College. He has published several articles on James T. Farrell; edited Farrell's *On Irish Themes*, a collection of his essays and other writings on Irish literature and history; and is resuscitating the James T. Farrell Society, an organization some think prematurely founded in the 1980s.

Carol S. Loranger, Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in English at Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio, teaches twentieth- and later nineteenth-century American literature and critical theory. Her scholarship has appeared in *Dreiser Studies*, *Pynchon Notes*, and the *Journal of Postmodern Culture*. With this issue she begins service as book review editor for *Dreiser Studies.*

Philip Gerber is Distinguished Professor Emeritus at the State University of New York in Brockport, where in 1990 he hosted the conference on "*Sister Carrie* at Ninety," out of which grew the present International Theodore Dreiser Society. He has published extensively on Dreiser since the 1960s, his latest book being *Theodore Dreiser Revisited* (1992).

Donald Pizer, Pierce Butler Professor of English Emeritus at Tulane University, has published extensively on Dreiser and is currently preparing a third edition of *Sister Carrie* in the Norton Critical Editions series.

Roger W. Smith is an independent scholar living in New York City. He is the bibliographer for *Dreiser Studies* and has recently published reviews of books on Edwin O'Connor and Walt Whitman in the *New York Sun* and on Clayton W. Henderson's biography of Paul Dresser in the *Indianapolis Star*. He is working on an updated bibliography of Dreiser.

Annemarie Koning Whaley is Associate Professor and Chair of the English Department at East Texas Baptist University. She completed her Ph.D. dissertation on textual editing in Dreiser's *Jennie Gerhardt* in 2000. She has presented a number of papers on this subject and has contributed articles to *CCTE Studies* and *Theodore Dreiser and American Culture: New Readings*, edited by Yoshinobu Hakutani (2000).